UNIVERSALISM

AGAINST ITSELF,

OR

AN EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION

OF THE

PRINCIPAL ARGUMENTS

CLAIMED IN SUPPORT OF THE FINAL HOLINESS AND HAPPINESS OF ALL MANKIND.

BY ALEXANDER HALL.

"Out of thy own mouth will I condemn thee."

ST. CLAIRSVILLE, O.:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.
1846.

CINCINNATI:
STEREOTYPED BY R. SHEPARD.

NOTE.

GENTLE READER: You need not expect that I am going to weary your patience or my own, by giving you a lengthy preface, or formal apology; and, as for introduction, I will hereby *introduce* you to the body of the work, and let you read for yourself. But before you commence, I have one word of friendly admonition to give you, and that is this: Please to do yourself the favor, and your humble servant the justice, to read this book through *carefully*,—examine every subject *thoroughly*,—scrutinize every position *rigidly*,—measure every sentence *critically*,—weigh every argument *fairly*,—decide every point *impartially*, and act upon the whole matter *honestly;* and if you are a believer in Universalism, you will throw that doctrine away; and if you do not believe it, there is no danger that you ever will.

A. HALL.

UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF.

CHAPTER I.

Proof-texts of Universalism Examined.

"PROVE ALL THINGS AND HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."
1 Thess. 5: 21.

1. Gen. 22. 18. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

1. Universalists rely upon this text with its parallels, as incontrovertible evidence that the whole human family will finally be made holy and happy. The assumption that promises of a Universal, or general character are *absolute* or *unconditional*, form the bone and sinew of Universalism; and let it once be made to surrender this ground, and nine tenths of its fortifications have fallen before the artillery of truth. With the reader's indulgence, we shall examine this subject thoroughly; and demonstrate that Universalism, as based upon the assumption of unconditional promises, has no foundation in the word of God, and like the splendid edifice erected upon the sand, must totter and fall to ruins.

2. The whole force of the argument depends upon the word *shall*:—"In thy seed *shall* all the nations of the earth be blessed." Universalists assume that it is unconditional, because no condition is here expressed. But *we shall now* prove beyond successful controversy

that many of the promises and threatenings of the bible are conditional, and depend upon the actions of men for their accomplishment, when the condition *is not expressed*, but merely implied. But previous to this, we lay down an important rule of interpretation, without which no man can shield the bible from numerous contradictions, and from an ignorance of which, have originated nearly all the false doctrines in christendom; and many, (especially among the Universalists,) from an ignorance of this *rule*, have turned avowed infidels, and denied in toto the divine authenticity of the bible. The rule is this: *that a condition being expressed in any part of the bible with respect to any promise or threat, that condition must be understood as implied, in all other places where that promise or threat is recorded, if not there expressed!* With this *rule* before us we shall now examine some of the threats and promises of the bible.

3. "And Jonah began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried and said: yet forty days, and Ninevah *shall* be overthrown." (Jonah 3. 4.) *Here* is no condition expressed. It is not said: "Yet forty days and Ninevah shall be overthrown," *if* they do not repent. But did not the Ninevites so understand it? Read the next verse: "So the people of Ninevah *believed God*, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them." Now if the people of Ninevah *believed God*, as it is here declared, why did they repent in sackcloth, unless they understood that there was a condition implied in this threat? and that they might by repentance escape the threatened judgment? Why did they not coolly submit to their fate,—await the forty days, and be destroyed, without exerting themselves in the manner they did? The response of all must be: it was because they understood that there was a condition *implied* in that threat. But was their understanding of the matter correct? Read on. "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil *way, and God* repented of the evil *he said he would do* unto *them, and he did it not.*" (verse 10.) Now Universalists

e to take one of three grounds: Either 1. That God the Ninevites a positive falsehood: or 2. That the evites were actually destroyed in forty days, and flatly contradict the bible: or 3. That there was a dition implied in that threat. The former two they not assert: hence the latter they are compelled to it, which lays the axe at the very root of Universal-

. "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith: I said ed that thy house, and the house of thy father should k before me forever; [no condition expressed here] now the Lord saith: be it far from me; [to perform promise,] for them that honor me, I will honor; and that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." (1 Sam. 0.) Thus, notwithstanding God had promised, with-expressing any condition, that the house of Ely, and house of his father should walk before him forever; because they refused to honor him, by the contempt which they had treated his ordinances, and thus did perform the condition *implied* in this promise;—efore the Lord reversed the matter, and instead of tinuing to confer upon them the honorary distinctions acerdotal dignity, brought upon them shame and con-on of face.

. "Then said David: O Lord God of Israel, thy ser-t hath certainly heard that Saul seeketh to come to lah to destroy the city for my sake. Will the men of lah deliver me up into his hand? will Saul come down, hy servant hath heard? O Lord God of Israel I ech thee, tell thy servant. And the Lord said: *he come down.* (No condition expressed.) Then said id: will the men Keilah deliver me and my men the land of Saul? And the Lord said: *they will de-thee up.* (No *if* in the case expressed.) Then Da-and his men, which were about six hundred, arose and arted out of Keilah,—and it was told Saul that David escaped from Keilah, and *he forbare to go forth.*" am. 23. 10–13.) Here again we have Universalists tight *place.* According to their doctrine, Saul did

come down; and the men of Keilah *did* deliver David and his men into the hand of Saul; because there was no condition expressed, and they tell us there can be none implied. Hence the bible is false, and David was killed by Saul in Keilah, notwithstanding he reigned King over Israel many years after Saul was dead. When God said, in reply to the requests of David: Saul *will come down;* and the men of Keilah will *deliver thee up;* it was implied: *if* you continue in the city. This the sequel proves; for David left the city, and consequently Saul did not come down, neither was David delivered in his hands. Universalists are compelled to acknowledge our position, or deny the truth of the Bible, or in the third place, take the ground that the Almighty told David a wilful falsehood.

6. We have another most striking evidence of the conditionality of divine promises when the condition is only implied; and that too in the case of Abraham. We can thus let one promise to Abraham explain another. To this none will object. "And he said unto Abram: know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years,—but in the fourth generation they *shall* come hither again. (Gen. 15. 13–16.) This promise is without an expressed condition; and has just as much appearance of *absoluteness*, as the one under examination upon which Universalism is based. I can fancy I hear the Jews, as they were traveling through the wilderness,—those disobedient fellows who were tinctured with Universalism,—debating with Moses and Aaron, and reasoning thus: "Surely we shall all be brought safely into the land of Canaan without the loss of one. This is as sure, and as firm, and as unalterably fixed as the pillars of heaven. For God swear to our father Abraham, that after his seed had sojourned in the land of Egypt 400 years, they should be brought again into this land; and there was no *if* in the case;—hence it is unconditional. Mark the positive, absolute *manner in which* it is expressed. 'In the fourth gener-

they SHALL *come hither again:*' and who dare
ı question the oath of Jehovah? Therefore ye men
:ael, although it would be better to walk in the
ıandments of God, yet you need have no fears with
ınce to that goodly land: the oath of Jehovah can-
ɜ broken; and though you lie, steal, commit forni-
ı, and bow down to other gods, and worship im-
nade with your own hands: still you are perfectly
ıs far as the land of Canaan is concerned; for *that*,
remembered, depends alone upon the unconditional
se to Abraham. God, you recollect, confirmed the
thing to us when we were eating the passover: 'It
:ome to pass, when ye be come to the land which
ord *will give you, according as he has promised.*'
12. 25.) What need we of farther witness? God
ıe *will* give us the land of Canaan, according as he
omised. No condition here neither: hence it will
:tainly ours; notwithstanding these partialists, Mo-
d Aaron, are continually limiting the Holy One of
, and teaching the absurd and cruel dogma, that
ıite offences will frustrate the purposes of God, and
n account of our sins, we shall die in the wilder-
and fail to reach the promised land. This is too
sterous to be believed, and hence there is no need
tting alarmed, for such monstrous absurdities are
ɡot up to frighten and gull the ignorant." *This*,
r, would no doubt have been good logic then, and
simile of the logic of Modern Universalism.

This kind of reasoning in the abstract, has some
rance of plausibility we confess: yet the Lord has
d to all such logic, and the difficulty we think, is
ıctorily disposed of. Let us now hear what he had
r: "As truly as I live saith the Lord;—your carcass-
ll fall in the wilderness, and all that were num-
of you, according to your whole number, from
y years old and upwards, which have murmured
ıt me, doubtless *ye shall not come into the land* con-
ıg which I *swear to make you dwell therein*, save Ca-
ɜ son of *Jephunneh*, and Joshua the son of Nun.

After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year shall you bear your iniquities, even forty years, and ye shall know my BREACH OF PROMISE,—in this wilderness they shall be consumed, and *there they shall die.*" (Num. 14. 28–35.) This settles the controversy with Universalism, as based upon the assumption of absolute promises.—Though God had made a promise to bring the posterity of Abraham into the land of Canaan, and had confirmed it with an oath, giving it all the appearance of *absoluteness* which can be attached to the proof-text under examination; yet, notwithstanding all this, the Jews by their unbelief and consequent disobedience, caused God to break that promise, and their carcasses fell in the wilderness: and Paul says: "They could not enter in, because of unbelief." (Heb. 3. 19.) It was not because God was unwilling to bring them in, but it was their own disobedience which caused the "*breach of promise.*" Had we no other proofs to offer upon this subject, the way the matter now stands, we would have ninety-nine probabilities out of a hundred, in favor of our position, and against Universalism. This however is but a tithe of the evidence we have to offer.

8. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then *I will repent of the good* wherewith *I said I would benefit them.*" (Jer. 18. 9, 10.) Now suppose we admit the text under examination, to be a promise of universal salvation, what would it avail Universalism, since God has most distinctly declared: "If they do evil in my sight, that they obey not my voice, *then will I repent of the* GOOD, [*universal salvation*] *wherewith I said I would* BENEFIT *them.*" Just as certain as God has promised salvation in heaven to any body, just so certain they may forfeit this *good*, wherewith God has said he would benefit them. Here then Universalists have met with a Waterloo defeat; and the only chance now left them, is to cry *for quarters;*—or if they are still determined to fight, let

eny that God has ever promised salvation in hea-
any body; (for we have seen that as certain as
is promised, so certain in may be forfeited by
lience) but take the ground, that all will be uni-
y saved by *chance!* They can build as good an
ent in favor of this position as the other, and get
much scripture to sustain it; i. e. none at all!
nce more: "When I say to the righteous that he
urely live, (this is expressed in language even
er than the promise to Abraham) *if* he trust to his
ghteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteous-
all not be remembered, but for his iniquity that he
ommitted, *he shall die for it.* Again, when I say
wicked, *thou shalt* SURELY *die*, (Universalists
say, this *surely* is unconditional) *if* he turn from
, and do that which is lawful and right,—he *shall
live*, he *shall not die.*" (Ezek. 33. 13–15.) There
o things in connection with this subject unaccount-
range. The first is: that the prophets should be
eedingly minute and particular, in teaching the
te of Universalism; and be so definite in stating,
iterating principles, which so pointedly subvert
root its very foundation. The second is: that the
of Universalism should ever have found a loca-
the cranium of any man of sense, and be defend-
f divinely sanctioned. The testimony of the proph-
above quoted, is most pointed and emphatic
t this doctrine. Suppose Universalists should find
which declared in so many words: "the whole hu-
mily *shall surely be saved;*" still it would not prove
rsalism, unless it could be demonstrated that the
human family, without exception, does that which
ful and right: for we can turn over to Ezekiel,
the Lord has once for all, and forever put an end
controversy upon this subject,—and where he has
us a clear, and most explicit explanation of all
romises. He there informs us, that though he should
e in language the most emphatic, that the *whole hu-
amily shall* SURELY *be saved;* yet if they should

commit iniquity, and refuse to do that which is la
and right, they *shall* SURELY *be damned*, they *s*
not be saved!! From this we learn, that there *canno*
such a thing as an *absolute* or *unconditional* promise
volving the happiness of man. God here informs
that though he should make the most *positive* prom
without expressing or even intimating a condition,
there would be a condition *implied;* and it would dep
upon the lawful, and righteous conduct of men for its
fillment! Here then is Universalism transfixed to
core. The quintescense of its very existence is desti
ed; and this one declaration of scripture without the
sistance of any other, fastens a mill-stone about its n
and swings it overboard into the bottom of the se
Sufficient has now been said, we think, to dispos
Universalism as based upon the assumption of abso
promises in general: yet it may be necessary to be a
tle more particular, and adduce a few more testimon
with respect to the promise at the head of this articl

10. Some deference at least, should be paid to
views entertained by the *apostles* concerning this pr
ise. We shall first hear the opinion of Peter, as he
honored with the keys of the kingdom of heaven.
very notable discourse, delivered by him in Solom
porch, before a large audience of the Jews, he decla
"Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the co
nant which God made with our fathers, saying u
Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of
earth be blessed. [Unconditionally? No.] Unto you f
God having raised up his son Jesus, *sent him to bless y*
[How?] *in turning away* every one of you *from his*
iquities." [Acts 3. 25, 26.] Now, I have no objectio
all men being saved, providing they all submit to
turned away from their iniquities. Peter here del
most positively, that they cannot be *blessed*, accordin
the promise made to Abraham, unless Christ does t
them away from their iniquities. And this he is to
here, by his *first* mission. [Mark the language.] "(
having raised up his son Jesus, SENT *him to bless yo*

not, *will send* him to bless you at the resurrection! But did Peter tell them in that discourse, what plan Christ had appointed, in order to turn them away from their iniquities? He certainly did. "*Repent* ye therefore and *be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,*" [verse 19,] or, [which is precisely the same,] that you may be *turned away from your iniquities.* From this testimony it is incontrovertably established, [if Peter understood the subject correctly,] that the *blessing* promised in the seed of Abraham, is forgiveness of sins, to be enjoyed by "*all nations*" in this life, and is suspended upon the conditions of *repentance* and *conversion!!* This utterly excludes Universalism from the kingdom of heaven; for Peter, having the keys of that kingdom, has forever locked the door against it.

11. We shall next hear the testimony of Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, and plenipotentiary minister of Jesus Christ. Universalists will certainly not object to his testimony; for they claim him to be a regular Universalist preacher. But let us hear what he says: "When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swear by himself,—that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, *we might have strong consolation who have* FLED *for refuge to* LAY HOLD *on the hope set before us.*" [Heb. 6. 13, 18.] From this we discover, that the *consolation*, or the *blessing* included in the promise to Abraham, was for those only who *fled for refuge*, and who *laid hold* on the *hope* set before them in the gospel. Thus Paul's explanation of this promise, so far from favoring the incongruous theory of Universalism, leaves the old ship BALLOU without helm, anchor, or rudder, to plough its way towards its unconditional harbor with TEKEL inscribed in large capitals upon every sail. But let us hear this apostle again: "The scriptures foreseeing that God would *justify* the heathen *through faith*, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying: in thee shall all nations be *blessed.*" [Gal. 3. 8.] According to this, the *blessing* referred to in the promise to Abraham, was nothing more

nor less than *justification by faith.* If this be not true, then Paul did not understand the subject correctly: and if it be true, then three things must follow: 1. That the promise to Abraham is conditional. 2. That all who are not *of faith* have no share in the blessing promised. And 3. That Paul was not a Universalist. In order now to determine whether we have correctly understood the apostle's view of this subject, we ask him this definite question: Who are to participate in the *blessing* promised to Abraham? He answers: "They which be *of faith,* are *blessed* with faithful Abraham," [verse 9.] In verse 29th he adds; "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and *heirs* according to the *promise.*" Who are Christ's? Ans. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." [Gal. 5. 24.] Heirship *according to the promise* we discover from this to be conditional. None are heirs, except those who are children; for Paul says: "If *children,* then *heirs.*" [Rom. 8. 17.] Let us now inquire if becoming *children of God,* and *children of Abraham,* is conditional; for, [mark it!] upon this is suspended *heirship* "according to the *promise.*" If we become children of God, and children of Abraham *conditionally*; then we become *heirs* according to the *promise, conditionally:* and consequently the *blessing* included in the *promise* to Abraham is not *absolute,* or *unconditional,* as Universalists so dogmatically assert. Let us see. "We are all the *children, of God, by faith* in Christ Jesus." [Gal. 3. 26.] "Know ye therefore, that they which are *of faith,* the same are the *children of Abraham.*" [Gal. 3. 7.] The whole matter now stands thus: (Paul's view of the subject being correct.) 1. We cannot be heirs, according to the promise made to Abraham, unless we belong to Christ the seed of Abraham; and we cannot be Christ's unless we crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts. 2. We cannot be heirs of the *blessing promised* to Abraham—the *unsearchable riches* of Christ, unless we are *children;* and none can be children, only those who "*are of faith;*" and hence the argument in favor of the *conditionality* of the *promise* to

Abraham, is put beyond the reach of controversy. Peter's explanation, as we have seen, left Universalism dead; but Paul's leaves the doctrine *twice* dead, and plucked up by the roots!

12. In conclusion upon this promise, we present *Universalism against itself.* Universalists contend that *all nations*, must mean the *whole human family*, without exception. All we have to do now, to make Universalism commit suicide, is to read another text with their own definition. "When the son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered *all nations*, [that is: the entire posterity of Adam] and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." [Math. 25. 31, 32.] Query: Was the whole human family arraigned before Titus at the destruction of Jerusalem? Were Universalists present on that occasion? If not, then the coming of the Lord is yet future, themselves being judges. We therefore speak within bounds, when we say that *Universalism is against itself*, and virtually renounced by its advocates, whenever this text is summoned to its support.

2. Psalm 22. 27. All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.

Psalm 86, 9. All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name.

Universalism teaches that this *turning to the Lord,—worshipping before him, and glorifying his name*, is all to take place in the resurrection state; and when this is done, all will be brought to know God, and be saved from sin. But here again we have *Universalism against itself:* for men cannot be made holy and happy in the

operation of being *raised* from the dead, as Universalism teaches; and at the same time be made holy and happy by *remembering*, and *turning* to the Lord, and *glorifying* his name, *after* they are raised! They cannot *remember*, and *turn to the Lord* and *worship* him, in the *resurrection*, for *this*, they will have no hand in; hence the worshiping and turning to the Lord, must take place afterwards; and consequently they must be *raised in their sins*. But let us look at these proof-texts. The word *shall*, upon which the whole argument is here based, has not the same meaning, as in the promise to Abraham just examined. It is here used in the sense of a command, as it always is when it precedes duties to be performed by man. The *remembering*, *worshipping*, *turning to the Lord*, and *glorifying* his name, are all duties to be performed by the "ALL NATIONS," "KINDREDS," and "ENDS OF THE WORLD," named in the above texts. It does not follow however, because God says all the ends of the world *shall turn*. that therefore they actually *will turn*. When Moses had predicted the coming of a prophet, whom the Lord should raise up like unto him, he concludes by saying: "Him SHALL ye hear." Did all the Jews hear that prophet? No. What proof then is there, that SHALL, in the above proof-texts, is any more likely to be accomplished? Universalists quote Dan. 7. 14, and apply it to this present world. We admit it; and it reads thus: "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that *all people*, *nations*, and *languages* should serve him." This is as extensive as the texts under examination; and now why, let me ask, does not all people, nations and languages serve him? Let Universalists explain this, and the explanation will apply unanswerably to the texts at the head of this article. They dare not apply this language of Daniel to eternity, for fear of verse 10; mark that! And hence they are bound to explain it, so as to harmonize with facts as they exist in this world; which is all we ask; and then it will be understood, that by the word *shall*, God commands "all the kindreds of the nations," and "all the ends of the world," to come

and worship before him, just as he "commands all men every where to repent," and leaves it optional with them whether to obey or not.

3. *Psalm 145, 9.* The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.

1. This text does nothing in favor of Universalism, but is in reality opposed to that doctrine: and we shall prove that UNIVERSALISM IS AGAINST ITSELF, in trying to compel it into its service. We will now state three facts, and draw one conclusion which will prove the above allegation. 1. God *is* good to all in the present tense: Mark that: IS good; not *will be* good in the resurrection, or at some other future period. 2. Some men are sinful and miserable *now*, notwithstanding God in the present tense *is* good to all. 3. God is immutable,—the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Therefore God will never be so good, but what he will allow sin and misery to exist.—This conclusion cannot be evaded; for God is *now*, just as good as he ever will be to all eternity; and yet, notwithstanding his present infinite goodness, which can never be increased an iota, hundreds and thousands live and die in their sins, guilty, miserable and condemned. Now if God's infinite goodness cannot, or will not save them here, then his immutability forbids their salvation forever. Universalists do not anticipate the dilemma in which they inevitably involve their doctrine, by quoting this text. It would be much better for their system, if they could find a text which declared, that God was not *now* very good, but would get better at the resurrection. This might give them some ground to hope that those, who die in their sins, would be redeemed at the resurrection, by the increased goodness of God. But as it is, it leaves them no ground for such an expectation, and is consequently opposed to this doctrine. 2. Again: "His tender mercies are over all his works." From this it is *inferred that all will be saved*; but it does no more

in favor of the salvation of all men in the future state, than it does for their salvation now. If the tender mercy of God can be over a man threescore and ten years, and he be sinful and miserable all the while; what proof is there that he may not be sinful and miserable in the future state, notwithstanding the tender mercy of God? But says one: "His mercy endureth forever." Well, what if it does? This mercy can permit men to practice inquity, till they become a curse to themselves, a disgrace to society, and finally curse God and die, and what better will it make the matter for such mercy to endure forever? The mercy that will allow a man to live in sin all his life, and die in this condition, will not help him out of the difficulty by enduring eternally.

3. But will it do to give this text a universal application? It will not. God is not good to *all*, in the most universal sense of that word ALL; neither are his tender mercies over *all* his works in this sense. Proof in abundance shall be given. Was God good to the Sodomites, when he rained down fire and brimstone upon their heads, till he had consumed them? Yes, says one; for God says himself: "I took them away as I saw GOOD." [Ez. 16. 50.] But good to whom? Not to the Sodomites surely, but it was good to righteous Lot and his family; and in the second place, as Jude says: They were "set forth for an EXAMPLE, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." [Jude 7.] Thus, it was a good example for "those who should afterwards live ungodly." [2 Pet. 2–6.] Paul settles this matter, and we think puts it forever at rest. "Behold therefore the *goodness* and *severity* of God; on them which *fell* SEVERITY, but towards thee *goodness*, IF *thou continue in his goodness*, otherwise thou also shalt be *cut off*." [Rom. 11. 22.] Here the word *severity* is used in contrast with *goodness*, and hence must mean directly the opposite. From this it is evident, that God is not good to ALL, in a universal sense; for it was not *goodness* to those who FELL, but *severity*, and *goodness* to others, upon the condition of *continuing in his goodness*.

4. *Universalists* try to make capital of the fact, that

ie psalmist so frequently makes use of the phrase, "His ıercy endureth forever," and that he repeats it a numer of times in one psalm. We will now give an exact from that psalm, and the reader can then judge ır himself, to whom the mercy of the Lord endureth orever. "O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, or his mercy endureth forever.—To him that SMOTE 'GYPT IN THEIR FIRST BORN, for his mercy endureth forver. And brought out Israel from among them, for his ıercy endureth forever. To him who divided the Red sa into parts, for his mercy endureth forever. And ıade Israel to pass through the midst of it, for his mercy ndureth forever. But OVERTHREW Pharaoh and his ost IN THE RED SEA, for his mercy endureth forever. 'o him which led his people through the wilderness, for is mercy endureth forever. To him which SMOTE great *ings*, for his mercy endureth forever. And SLEW *famous ings*, for his mercy endureth forever. Sihon, king of he Amorites, for his mercy endureth forever. And Og, he King of Bashan, for his mercy endureth forever. \nd gave their land for an heritage, for his mercy enıureth forever. Even an heritage unto Israel, for his nercy endureth forever. And hath redeemed us from ur enemies, for his mercy endureth forever." [Ps. 136.] 'hus we discover, that the mercy of the Lord endureth orever toward his people who fear him, by delivering hem out of the hands of their enemies, and not at all owards the wicked whom he slew for their sake. The 'salmist has taken this same view of the subject frequently. Hear him: "With the MERCIFUL, thou wilt how thyself MERCIFUL." [Ps. 18. 25.] "All the paths f the Lord are *mercy* and truth, unto such as KEEP his OVENANT and his TESTIMONIES." [Ps. 25. 10.] "Many orrows shall be to the wicked, but he that TRUSTETH in he Lord, *mercy* shall compass him about." [Ps. 32. 10.] 'The *mercy* of the Lord is from everlasting to everlastng, upon them that FEAR him." [Ps. 103. 17.] This ells precisely who the mercy of the Lord endureth forver to. It is "*from* EVERLASTING to EVERLASTING, upon

THEM THAT FEAR HIM." Universalism teaches, that the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon the wicked, just as much as upon those that fear God! Isaiah testifies concerning the wicked, who were past reformation thus: "Therefore he that made them, *will not have* MERCY *upon them*, and he that formed them, *will show them no* FAVOR." [Is. 27. 11.] How can a man be saved, if God that formed him, shows him NO FAVOR?

5. Again: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and HE WILL HAVE MERCY UPON HIM." [Is. 55. 7.] Universalism teaches, that God will have mercy upon him, whether he returns from his evil way or not. Again says God: "Therefore will I also deal in FURY, mine eye shall not *spare, neither will I have* PITY, and though they cry in mine ears with a loud voice, *yet will I not* HEAR *them*." [Ezek. 8. 18.] "And I will dash them one against another, even the fathers and the sons together, saith the Lord. *I will not* PITY, *nor* SPARE, *nor have* MERCY, *but* DESTROY *them*." (Jer. 13. 14.)—Though the Psalmist has truly said: "Like as a father PITIETH his children, so the Lord PITIETH *them that* FEAR HIM." (Ps. 103. 13.) Yet it is also true, as testifies God by the mouth of Solomon: "Because I have called and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will *laugh at your* CALAMITY; I will *mock when your* FEAR COMETH; when your fear cometh as DESOLATION, and your DESTRUCTION *cometh as a whirlwind;* when DISTRESS and ANGUISH *cometh upon you:* then shall they call upon me, *but I will not* ANSWER; they shall seek me early, *but they shall not* FIND ME." (Prov. 1. 24–28.) And Paul informs us, that "He that despised Moses's law, DIED WITHOUT MERCY, under two, or three witnesses." (Heb. 10. 28.) No man can honestly read the above declarations of scripture, and believe that the tender mercies of God, are over all his works, in the Universalist acceptation of the word ALL. *James says:* "He shall have *judgment* without MERCY, [on

them] that have *showed no* MERCY;" (Jam. 2. 13.) and the revelator speaks of some, who "shall *drink* of the wine of the *wrath of God*, which is poured out WITHOUT MIXTURE, into the cup of his INDIGNATION." (Rev. 14. 10.) Yes: *wrath* without *mixture:* No mercy mingled with the wrath of God, that shall be poured out upon the finally incorrigible. It cannot be said that *wrath* is but another name for disciplinary stripes; for such stripes are a means of salvation; and John the Baptist exhorts the Jews to "Flee *from the* WRATH to come;" (Math. 3. 7.) not to flee from a means of salvation. Paul says, that Christ "delivered us *from the* WRATH *to come;*" (1 Thess. 1. 10,) and that "we shall be *saved from* WRATH through him." [Rom. 5. 9.] Not saved *by* wrath which would have been the case, had wrath meant disciplinary punishment, according to the theory of Universalism. After all these facts, if any man can believe that Psalm 145. 9, teaches Universalism; he must believe it; that's all.

4. Prov. 10. 24. The desire of the righteous shall be granted.

1. The argument which Universalists build upon this text is the following: All righteous men desire the salvation of the whole human family; God has promised, that the desire of the righteous shall be granted: therefore the whole human family will be saved. We shall now off-set this argument, by building another according to the same logic.

It is the desire of the righteous, that all men should be saved from sin in this life, and become sober, honest, and respectable citizens; God has promised that the desire of the righteous shall be granted; therefore all men are now saved from sin, and are sober, honest, and respectable citizens! As far as argument is concerned we are now even; whilst facts, and the bible contradict us both. We remark that this phrase, is a sort of general principle, and refers probably to the desire of the right-

eous concerning their own personal salvation; and not to any thing, and every thing they may desire; for this being the case, we would be involved immediately in an inextricable labyrinth of contradictions. The Saviour declares, that "many prophets and *righteous men, have* DESIRED to see those things which ye see, and *have not seen them.*" [Math. 13. 17.] Ask a Universalist, if he *desires* to make all the orthodox believe Universalism; and he will answer yes. Now one of two conclusions are unavoidable; either he is an unrighteous man; or has an unrighteous theory!

2. But UNIVERSALISM IS AGAINST ITSELF, in bringing this text to its support. The first part of this text Universalists never quote: it reads thus: "The FEAR of the wicked it *shall come upon him;*" then comes in the other: "but the desire of the righteous shall be granted." Now as Universalists give the last part of this text a universal application, the first part must necessarily have the same latitude; and consequently every thing that the wicked *fear* shall come upon them. And as hundreds and thousands of the wicked fear endless damnation, therefore it shall be their portion; for, (mark it!) God says: "The FEAR of the wicked *it shall come upon him.*" Here Universalism has to give up the ghost, as far as this text is concerned.

5. Prov. 11. 31. Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner.

This text is relied upon as proof that all men are rewarded and punished in this life, to the full amount of their just deserts. But we have any amount of testimony on hand, to prove that this is not a correct conclusion.

1. The language of this text refutes such an idea.—How can the sinner be recompensed "*much more*" than the righteous, if both are recompensed to the *full amount?* *Impossible.*

2. This language was spoken under, and with reference to, the Jewish dispensation. Under that dispensation men, as a general thing, received a temporal recompence for their good, as well as their evil deeds, according to the Law.

3. If Universalists are resolved that this shall refer to the Christian dispensation; we will agree, for the sake of argument: and then comes up, what part of the Christian dispensation does it refer to? The Saviour shall answer. "And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed, at the RESURRECTION *of the* JUST." [Luke 14. 14.] But it may be asked according to this, will they be recompensed on the earth? Most certainly. Where can the resurrection take place, but upon this earth where the dead are buried? Thus, at the resurrection, the Lord himself declares, they shall be recompensed, for there and then a crown of righteousness shall be placed upon the heads of all the faithful; and there and then the wicked will receive their sentence, and the seal of their everlasting banishment, from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power.—This much must suffice for the present until we come to treat upon the subject of conscience, when this question shall be again resumed. Enough has been said to redeem this text from the service of Universalism, and to prove that it is even *against itself* in marshaling Prov. 11. 31, into the field; for if the righteous are recompensed in this life all that they deserve, as Universalism teaches, and if the wicked are recompensed *much more* than the righteous, as the text affirms; it follows hence that the wicked are punished more than they deserve, and therefore punished unjustly. Now if God will punish sinners unjustly in this world, what good reason can Universalists assign, why he may not continue to do the same in eternity? For he that is unjust in little will also be unjust in much.

6. Is. 25. 8. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces.

This text, although quoted with the greatest confidence by the advocates of Universalism, will nevertheless disprove their doctrine. It is true, "the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces;" but *all whose* faces? That's the point. The remainder of this verse will decide. "And the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of HIS PEOPLE shall he take away from off all the earth." Thus the *all faces* has reference to the people of God. Universalists assume, that *all faces*, necessarily embrace the whole human family. Should this prove to be a mistake, then the *House* that Ballou built must seek some other foundation or fall. Let us see. The prophet says: "*All faces* are turned into paleness." [Jer. 30. 6.] Were the faces of the entire human race turned into paleness, in the days of Jeremiah, when millions upon millions of them were not then in existence? Were the faces of Enoch and Elijah who were then in heaven turned into paleness? Answer ye. Again: "Before their faces the people shall be much pained, *all faces* shall gather blackness." [Joel 2. 6.] If *all faces*, in this verse, signify the whole human family, then it must refer to the resurrection. This is too obvious to need proof. Now if Is. 25. 8. proves universal salvation, because tears shall be wiped from off *all faces;* then Joel 2. 6. proves universal damnation at the resurrection: because, "the people shall be *much pained;* and ALL FACES shall gather BLACKNESS." But Universalism is evidently against itself in quoting this proof-text, and applying it to the resurrection. Read the next verse: "And it shall be said in that day, [i. e. the day of the resurrection,] Lo, this is our God, we have *waited* for him, and he will SAVE US, this is the Lord, we have *waited* for him, we will be *glad and rejoice* in his SALVATION." Thus Universalists *have to admit*, in quoting this text, that none have the

promise of salvation in the resurrection only those tha. have *waited* for the Lord. This also agrees with the New Testament. "To them that *look for him* [or wait for him,] shall he appear the second time, without sin unto *salvation*." [Heb. 7. 28.]

The next verse tells what will become of those who have not *waited* for the Lord, and consequently who are not *his people*. "And Moab (i. e. the wicked) *shall be* TRODDEN DOWN under him, even as straw is trodden down for the dunghill; and he shall spread forth his hands in the midst of them, as he that swimeth, spreadeth forth his hands to swim; and he *shall bring down their pride* together with the spoils of their hands." (verses 10, 11.) This then, is all to take place at the resurrection of the dead, according to the Universalist's application of this text. This is parallel also with Rev. 21. 4, which we shall notice in due time. From what has already been said upon this text, Universalism must feel itself handcuffed perfectly.

7. Is. 45. 22–24. Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God and besides me there is none else. I have sworn by myself: the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return; that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear; surely shall *one* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.

1. This is a very important text with Universalists; but a more perfectly suicidal effort cannot be made by the advocates of Universalism, than is made in bringing this text to their support. This we shall prove to the entire satisfaction of every intelligent reader. And in the first place, Universalists have to deny the King's translation, by expunging the word *one*, before the text will come within a thousand miles of Universalism. The translation of the Polyglott margin, is also against Uni-

versalism. It reads thus: "He shall say of me, in the Lord is all righteousness and strength." This does not say who shall have this righteousness and strength, but simply states that it is in the Lord. Hence Universalists have to deny two translations, and make a new one of their own, before they can make Is. 45, harmonize with their theory. But still it is a failure: The context disproves their doctrine. "*Look* unto me and *be ye saved*, all the ends of the earth." Is not this conditional? Universalism teaches that all the ends of the earth shall be saved, whether they *look* unto the Lord or not. This is *Universalism against itself*, No. 1.

2. Universalists admit that this prediction applies to the resurrection state: this they have to do, as a matter of course, or it does nothing for their theory, make the most of it.

Let us now read the language immediately following that above quoted. "Even to him shall men come, [i. e. in the resurrection state,] and all that are INCENSED against him shall be ASHAMED." Thus some men are to be INCENSED; that is, ENRAGED, or AT ENMITY against God in the resurrection state! Will such be holy and happy? As some men are to be ASHAMED in the resurrection, will such characters be saved? No; for Paul says: "Whosoever believeth on him, shall not be *ashamed*." (Rom. 9. 33.) Hence they are unbelievers in eternity, and consequently condemned. Mark this, *Universalism against itself*, No. 2.

3. But worse and worse for this contradictory system. By referring Isaiah 45. 23, to the resurrection state; they admit that there, and then is to be the JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST. Now hear the apostle Paul: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ. (How do you know Paul?) Because, "it is written." (Where? In Is. 45. 23. What?) "As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God." (Rom. 14. 10, 11.) Thus the whole theory of Univer-

salism is effectually capsized by applying this proof-text as it does, to the resurrection state; for Paul quotes the very same passage, and proves by it that we shall stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ, at the very time when this BOWING and CONFESSING shall take place.—Put this down, Universalism against itself, No. 3.

4. But the last verse of this chapter is supposed to teach Universalism. "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." This however can only prove the salvation of all the Jewish nation, make the most of it. But even this cannot be done. In order to make this text tell any thing in favor of Universalism, two things must be proved. 1. That SHALL is used in an absolute or unconditional sense; or in other words, that there is not a condition implied, as in the promise to Abraham; and 2. That "All the seed of Israel" means the entire Jewish nation, as contradistinguished from the Gentiles, without a single exception. If Universalists undertake either, they will fail; whilst the negative of both can be sustained. 1. The Jews were justified in the days of the apostles invariably upon the conditions of believing, and submitting to the gospel, and we have no account of any Jew or Gentile being justified, only upon these terms: hence there is a condition *implied* in Isaiah's SHALL, and must be understood the same as if he had said: "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory, providing they submit to the Gospel." This is its true signification. 2. "All the seed of Israel" does not mean the entire Jewish nation. Proof: "Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight; there was none left but the tribe of Judah only,—and the Lord rejected *all the seed of Israel*, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hand of spoilers." [2 Kings, 27. 18, 20.] Did the Lord afflict, and deliver into the hand of spoilers, the entire posterity of Abraham, when thousands of them had died and gone to their graves centuries before, and millions of them were yet unborn? Thus *all the seed of Israel* does not necessarily mean any more than all, or a

majority of the Jews living at any one time; and hence if we take away every thing from this text, except the part that teaches Universalism, it will be like the man's gun, without lock, stock, or barrel.

8. Is. 46. 10. My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.

Is. 53. 10. The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.

Upon these two texts of scripture we remark: 1. That God has a *counsel* and *pleasure* of his own, which belongs exclusively to himself to perform, independent of the agency of man. This counsel *will stand*, and this pleasure *will be performed*. With respect to this, it is declared: "He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him what doest thou?" [Dan. 4. 35.] But 2, God has a counsel and pleasure to perform, connected with the moral agency of man; a part of which man himself is to perform, or it remains undone. This I will prove. The Psalmist testifies: "Thou art not a God that hast *pleasure* in wickedness." [Ps. 5. 4.] As God is unchangeable, his pleasure has always been that wickedness should not exist; yet wickedness has existed for nearly six thousand years. Now, God has not performed all his pleasure with reference to the destruction of wickedness, for this reason; it requires the co-operation of man to bring about this result. If God absolutely performed all his *pleasure*, in matters with which man's agency was connected, then it would be an impossibility for man to commit sin, or to *displease* God in any way. This conclusion is too obvious to be called in question: The converse also, must be equally self evident, that is, if man *can*, and actually does displease God, then the pleasure of the Lord is not always done. Let us see: "But with many of them God was not well *pleased*." [1. Cor. 10. 5.] Then it follows, that *he was* displeased, which proves that his pleasure is not

always done. Again: "Before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God." [Heb. 11. 5.] In this case the pleasure of the Lord was performed; but it was owing to the obedience of Enoch. Again, says the apostle: "If any man draw back, my soul shall have *no pleasure* in him." [Heb. 10. 38.] In such a case the pleasure of the Lord would not be done, which is another confirmation of the truth of the above positions. 3. The fact that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in the hands of Christ, is no proof that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in the hands of the wicked, or that the wicked will all be saved. These are two very different propositions. The pleasure of the Lord that Christ had to perform did prosper in his hands. Hence we hear him say; "Not my will but thine be done." (Luke 22. 42.) This proof-text cannot embrace every thing in the Universe which is according to the pleasure of the Lord: if so, then Christ would long since have done away with sin, and every species of evil in existence, for we have it positively declared that the Lord has no *pleasure* in them; and hence it must be according to his pleasure for them to be done away.

9. Is. 53. 11. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.

This text comes far short of proving Universalism. It is assumed that all that Christ desired he should see accomplished, and thus be satisfied. But this is not the case. He desired the salvation of Jerusalem as a city, when he said: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem—how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." (Math. 23. 37.) Christ was not satisfied in this case; for he complains and says: "Ye will not come unto me that you might have life." (John 5. 40.) But did he really desire them to come? Certainly. Hear him entreat: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I *will give you* rest;" [Math. 11. 28.] but

they did not come, and consequently the Saviour was not satisfied in the Universalist application of this text. Again: Christ desires the salvation of all men in this life, as much as he does in the next; but is he satisfied? By no means. This difficulty will stare Universalists in the face; but they cannot dispose of it. Christ however is satisfied with what he has done in bringing about, and completing a plan of salvation; and in the out-come, if but a few are saved, the Saviour will be satisfied: because no blame can be reflected upon him, and because those who are not saved, might have been, had they been disposed; and therefore their damnation is just. Thus: "He shall see of the travail of his soul, [i. e. those who have believed and obeyed the gospel,] and shall be satisfied."

10. Is. 55. 11. *So* shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.

Universalists assume that this scripture proves their doctrine, from the fact that God has sent forth his word to effect the salvation of all men; and he declares that it shall accomplish the thing for which he sent it. But we shall soon discover that this argument, like most others, has its foundation laid deep in sophistry. Look at the first word in the text: "SO shall my word be." How? Read the preceding verse, and it will tell. "For AS the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither; but watereth the earth, and maketh it to bring forth and bud, *that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater;*" (Then comes in the text:) "SO shall my word be." How? "AS the rain." This solves the whole difficulty. The rain comes down and prepares the soil, that man may have seed to sow and *bread to eat;* providing he attend to the ordinances of

nature,—the ordinances of plowing, sowing, reaping, gathering into his barn, and preparing for use. But the rain brings bread to no man independent of his own exertion and co-operation. "*So* shall my word be," says God: "it shall accomplish that which I please;" (upon the same principle of the rain which comes down from heaven;) it shall bring the blessings of the gospel within the reach of man, and if he, by attending to the means of grace, "LAY HOLD" of the rich boon of "ETERNAL LIFE," he will be blessed; but if he, like the sluggard, will not plow by reason of the cold, he shall beg in the immortal harvest and have nothing. Thus *Universalism is against itself* in bringing into its service this declaration of the prophet, and for this reason: it is admitted that the word of God is sent forth to secure the future and immortal salvation of man;—this shows in the first place, that man's future salvation was, and is in danger, which Universalists deny; and as the word of God accomplished its object, upon the same principle that the rain gives seed to the sower and bread to the eater, which is by attending to MEANS; then it follows, that none can enjoy the future salvation, only such as comply with the conditions which the word of God has enjoined.

11. Lam. 3. 31. **For the Lord will not cast off forever.**

Is. 57. 16. For I will not contend forever, neither, will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made.

1. These two declarations of scripture have been reiterated by Universalist preachers and editors, until they are worn thread-bare, without once appealing to the context to know WHO "the Lord will not cast off forever." In the chapter from which the first text is quoted, Jeremiah is lamenting his own afflictions, and those of his brethren, and says: "the Lord will not cast off forever;" that is, such as *return from* their evil way, and reform at

the chastisements of the Lord. This is confirmed by verse 25: "The Lord is GOOD unto them that wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him." But he changes the subject at the close of that chapter, and speaks of the destiny of those who are the enemies of God, and of his people: who were not subjects of this merciful chastisement. "Render unto them a recompense, O Lord, according to the works of their hands; give them sorrow of heart; thy *curse* upon them; *persecute* and *destroy* them in *anger* from under the heavens of the Lord." [Lam. 3. 64–66.] This does not look much like Universalism; To *recompense* them in *anger*, and with *sorrow* of heart;—to *curse* them, and *persecute* them, and *destroy* from under the heavens of the Lord! If this be Universalism; it is it indeed, with a curse, persecution, destruction, and a vengeance!

2. The context of the other quotation is also against Universalism. When the prophet Isaiah testifies that the Lord "will not contend *forever*," he refers, (as does Jeremiah,) to those who are chastised, and who are thereby led to reformation; and not at all to the wicked, who "wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." He refers to these latter characters, in the following verses, in contrast with those with whom the Lord would not *contend forever*. "*But*, [says he, showing the contrast,] the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is NO PEACE to the wicked, saith my God." [Verses 20, 21.] If a man lives wicked all his life, he has no PEACE. If he should die, and go into eternity wicked, still he has no PEACE. If he is raised from the dead wicked, (which he will be, as we shall hereafter prove,) then he will continue to remain wicked; and continue like the troubled sea when it cannot REST. Thus the context is against Universalism in both cases, which is *Universalism against itself*, No. 1.

3. But we have *Universalism against itself*, No. 2, in trying to twist these two texts, so as to testify in its favor. By doing so, it is admitted that *forever*, and "*cast*

off forever," means to all eternity. It would not suit their theory at all, to say that *forever* means a limited duration. Let us try it. "The Lord will not cast off for a *little while*." This will not work, for they contend that the Lord will cast off a little while, but he will not *cast off* FOREVER, i. e. eternally. Very good. Hear now what David says to Solomon: "If thou seek him he will be found of thee, but *if* thou forsake him, he will *cast thee off* FOREVER." [1. Chron. 28. 9.] That is, he will *cast thee off to all* ETERNITY, which Universalists admit to be the correct meaning of that phrase!

12. Ezek. 33. 11. Say unto them: as I live saith the Lord God; I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.

1. This text is quoted by Universalists to prove that none will be finally lost. They must therefore necessarily admit that the *dying* here spoken of, refers to an *eternal death* beyond the grave; as this is what they quote it to disprove.

2. Here *Universalism is against itself* by this admission; for the remainder of the verse proves conclusively, that the wicked would *die* that *death*, or be finally lost, unless they returned. "*Turn ye, turn ye*, from your evil ways; for WHY WILL YOU DIE?" They cannot evade this difficulty by denying this death to refer to the future state: for mark the fact; they start out upon the assumption that God's pleasure cannot be frustrated; and it is his pleasure that the wicked *should not die;* hence it *cannot* mean the death of the body, or a death in sin; for Universalists admit that they *do die these deaths;* it cannot therefore have this meaning, as the pleasure of God would thus be frustrated. There is no other ground left that they can take, according to their views of the pleasure of God, but to refer this *death* to the future state of existence.

3. But we can prove that it refers to the future and eternal death, *beyond this life*, without the admission of

Universalists. 1. It cannot mean the natural death of the body; for *that*, the righteous have to suffer as well as the wicked:—neither can the wicked avoid it by turning from their wicked ways, which is the case with the death here referred to. 2. It cannot signify a moral death, or death in sin, for this reason: The wicked whom the Lord addressed were *then* dead in trespasses and in sins; and still they had not died the death here spoken of; for he says: "Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways, for *why will you die?*" in the future, (mark that!) not why *are you dead?* or why do you *remain dead?* which would have been the case, had he spoken of a moral death. Hence there is no other logical ground to take than that it has direct reference to an eternal death beyond the grave.

4. But says one, if this death does refer to the future state, no one need fear it; for God declares he has no pleasure in it. But we will prove that the pleasure of the Lord is, and has been frustrated in many instances. And permit me to remark, that as God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, either his pleasure is frustrated, or else the text does not refer to any death to be inflicted in this present state of existence. This no man can get over, nor under, nor around. If the latter, then they will die this death in some other state of existence; for the text positively declares, that they *shall die*, unless they *turn from their evil ways*. Here Universalism is compelled to hang upon one or the other horn of an inflexible dilemma, either of which will goar it to death. But the Lord declares to the Jews: "I have *no* PLEASURE *in you*, saith the Lord of hosts; neither will I accept an offering at your hands." [Mal. 1. 10.] Here the Jews were contrary to the pleasure of God, and ergo his pleasure was frustrated. Again: "For thou art not a God, that hast PLEASURE in wickedness." [Ps. 5. 4.] As God has no PLEASURE in wickedness, it follows that every sin a man commits, he frustrates the PLEASURE of God.—"Without faith it is impossible to PLEASE God." [Heb. 11. 6.] "Howbeit, with many of them God was not *well PLEASED*." [1. Cor. 10. 5.] "But to do good, and to

communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is *well* PLEASED." [Heb. 13. 16.] "The Lord taketh PLEASURE in them that FEAR him." [Ps. 147. 11.] "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no PLEASURE in him." [Heb. 10. 38.] These passages show that God has *pleasure* in some things, and some persons, and has no *pleasure* in others: which proves that things are frequently contrary to his pleasure: and from this it follows that the wicked may, and actually will die the second, and eternal death, unless they return from their evil ways, although God has *no pleasure* in it.

13. Mal. 2. 10. Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?

1. Upon this text Universalists base their argument of Universal paternity;—that God is the father of the whole human family; and consequently that all will be saved.

I admit the premises:—that God is the father of the whole human family in the sense of this text, i. e. because he has *created* them; but I deny the conclusion.—God is just as much *now* the father of all mankind, as he ever will be, and yet all are not now saved. God has always been the father of mankind in this sense; and yet sin and misery have always existed. If the fact that God is our father, will eventually destroy sin and misery, why did not that fact prevent its existence altogether? If God is the father of all, and will permit, and even foreordain his dear children to be sinful and miserable three score and ten years, as Universalists contend, what good reason can be assigned why he may not continue the same paternal regard over them to all eternity?—The very fact that God is immutable, proves that he will do it; and thus we have *Universalism against itself* by taking the above position.

2. But God is the father of the whole brute creation in the same sense that he is the father of all mankind; that is by *creation*. Will all the animal tribes be made holy and *happy in heaven*? According to the doctrine

of Universal paternity they will. But it is said the paternal character of God is confined to the intelligent creation, for he is called: "The God of the *spirits of all flesh*." [Num. 27. 16.] But are not beasts as well as men, embraced in the phrase, *all flesh*? Let us read: "And *all flesh* died that moved upon the earth, both of *fowl*, and of *cattle*, and of *beast*, and of every *creeping thing* that creepeth upon the earth." [Gen. 7. 21.] Paul testifies the same thing: "All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of *men*, another of *beasts*, another of *fishes*, and another of *birds*." [1. Cor. 15. 39.] So, if the phrase *all flesh* proves the salvation of all mankind, it proves the salvation of every beast, fowl, fish and creeping thing! But, says the reader, "he is the God of the SPIRITS of all flesh." Have beasts spirits? Hear Solomon: "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the *spirit* of the *beast* that goeth downward to the earth." [Ec. 3. 21.]

3. Our being the children of God by nature secures only the blessings of Providence: but there are blessings of a higher order,—the spiritual blessings, which are to be enjoyed through the sufferings, death and mediation of the Saviour; and in order to this, we must become the children of God in a higher and more elevated sense than nature,—by *adoption* into the family of God. In this sense a man has to be more than born of the flesh, to be constituted a child. He must be born again—"born of *water*, and of the *spirit*," [John 3. 5.] in order to "receive the spirit of *adoption* by which we cry Abba, Father." [Rom. 8. 15.] Hence says Paul: "They which are the children of the *flesh*, these are not the *children of God*." [Rom. 9. 8.] But in order to become the children of God in this more exalted sense, he informs us that we must submit to the government of Christ. "For as many as are *led* by the Spirit of God, they are the SONS *of God*." [Rom. 8. 14.] "We are all the *children of God* BY FAITH in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." [Gal. 3. 26, 27.] "Do all things without murmurings

putings, that you may be blameless and harmless,
's OF GOD." [Phil. 2. 14, 15.] "Wherefore come
m amongst them, and be ye separate, saith the
ınd touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive
ıd will be a father unto you, and you shall be my
ıd DAUGHTERS, saith the Lord Almighty." [2 Cor.
18.] "For whosoever shall do the will of my fa-
ıich is in heaven, the same is my *brother* and *sister*,
ther;" [Math. 12. 50.] and consequently are the
n of God. "He that *overcometh* shall inherit all
and I will be his God, and he shall be MY SON."
!1. 7.] From the above scriptures we draw the
ion, that none can sustain towards God the spirit-
tion of children, without previously submitting to
ns of reconciliation.

ut all men are not the children of God in a spir-
nse; for some are the children of the devil; and as
d the devil are put in contrast in the scriptures:
hose who are the children of the devil cannot be
ldren of God. Jesus positively declares: "Ye
serve *God* and *mammon;*" (Math. 6. 24,) and for
son, they are diametrically opposed; and for the
eason, no man can be a child of *God*, and a child
levil, at the same time. This proposition is clear-
ined by the word of God. "Jesus said unto them:
were your FATHER, ye would love me,—ye are of
ATHER THE DEVIL, and the lusts of your father ye
." (John 8. 42, 44.) "The field is the world: the
ed are the children of the KINGDOM; *but the tares*
children of the WICKED ONE." (Math. 13. 38.)—
of all subtilty, and all mischief; thou *child of the*
thou enemy of *all righteousness*." (Acts 13. 10.)
s *the children of* GOD are manifested, and the *chil-*
the DEVIL: whosoever doeth not righteousness *is*
God." (1 John 3. 10.) From this it can be seen
lf an eye, that those who are the children of *God*,
be the children of the *devil;* no more can those
e the children of the *devil*, be the children of *God*,
and the *same time*. Impossible. But who, or

what this *devil* is, we shall hereafter show. One thing at a time, is our motto in all cases.

5. But upon this subject we conclude we have said nearly enough for the present. How Universalists can build their hypothetical dogma of universal salvation upon this proof-text, is more than I can decipher. The fact that men are now the children of God, as Universalists contend, and are now sinful and miserable, as they have to admit, is an insurmountable barrier, (and will forever be) in the way of Universalism. They are now sinful, from one of two considerations: either God *cannot*, or *will not* save them. Take the first, and say he *cannot*; and it follows that he never can; for infinite power cannot be increased. But choose the second, and say he *will not*; and it follows that he never will, for he is "without variableness or shadow of turning." [James 1. 17.]

14. Math. 1. 21. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he *shall save his people* from their sins.

Before this text can be made to favor Universalism, two things must be proved: 1. That *his people*, here signifies the whole human family; and, 2. that *shall* is used unconditionally; or that there is not a condition implied, as in the promise to Abraham. Neither of these can be done by any man now living.

1. Christ possesses men in three senses; first: in the sense of dominion or power, which he has a right to exercise over them. This extends to all, and to this apply the following scriptures: "Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." [Ps. 2. 8.] "As thou hast given him power over all flesh." [John 17. 2.] "The father loveth the son, and hath given all things into his hands." (John 3. 35.) "His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the rivers even to the ends of the earth." (Zech. 9. 10.) "And Jesus

came and spake unto them saying: all power in heaven and in earth is given unto me." (Math. 28. 18.)

2. Christ possesses men in the sense of consanguinity. Thus it is said: "He came unto his *own* and his own received him not." (John 1. 11.) i. e. his own brethren according to the flesh,—the Jewish nation. This is undoubtedly the sense of the text: "he shall save *his people* from their sins," that is, he shall save the children of Israel from their sins, upon the condition of reformation: this the apostle Peter declares in language which confirms the truth of this whole matter: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a *Saviour*, to give *repentance* to *Israel*, and the *forgiveness of sins*." (Acts 5. 31.)

Thus, Christ is a *Saviour*, and he will save *Israel* his people, by *forgiving their sins*, upon the condition of their exercising "*repentance* unto life." (Acts 11. 18.)

3. Christ owns persons in the sense of spiritual relationship,—as "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." [Eph. 5. 30.] With reference to this it is said: "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." [Rom. 8. 9.] Christ's people in this sense are already saved from sin, whenever they become his; and hence, the saving *his people*, in the text, cannot refer to those who are spiritually his, but to his Jewish brethren, as we have seen. Hence we hear it said concerning John the Baptist: "And thou child shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the *Lord* to prepare *his* ways, to give knowledge of salvation to *his people* by the remission of their sins." [Luke 1. 76, 77.] Thus John the Baptist was sent to the Lord's people, who were, as admitted by all, the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And the way they were saved from their sins under the ministry of John, Christ, and the apostles, was by submitting to the terms of pardon, which they severally made obligatory upon them.

As Christ saves no man from sin here, only upon the principle of voluntary obedience, what will become of

those who die in their sins? Before Universalists can get them saved, they must prove three things.

1. That God will give them laws in eternity, by which they can be brought into his favor.

2. That those who die in their sins, will after that possess the principle of volition; and

3. That they will exercise that principle, in voluntary obedience. If they possess the principle of volition, how do they know but that they will voluntarily choose to continue in sin, in the next world, as well as in this? since "wicked men and seducers wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." [2 Tim. 3. 13.]

One passage more: When Christ sent forth his apostles to preach to *his people*,—the *Jews* first, and then to the Gentiles, the way by which they could be *saved* from their sins, he laid down this principle: "He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved*." (Mark 16. 16.) All admit this to be a salvation from sin; and hence salvation from sin is conditional. Query: Can a man be saved in heaven, without being saved from sin? No. Then heaven is conditional. But it is said this refers to time: yes, and to eternity likewise. Now suppose a man is saved from his sins according to the above principle,—lives saved all his lifetime, and dies saved; will he not remain saved eternally? Yes. And upon the same principle, if a man is damned here in time, lives damned all his life, and dies damned, he will continue damned forever and ever. The same plan Universalists will adopt to get a man saved after he dies damned, I will also adopt to get him damned after he dies saved.

15. Math. 5. 17, 18. **Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill; for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.**

In connection with this text Universalists quote Rom. 13. 10. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." The argument then stands thus: The law here referred to, is universal and eternal; and as "love is the fulfilling of the law," and as one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled; it follows that all men universally will be brought *to love God;* for this is the fulfilling of the law. This, though considered among Universalists a strong argument, is nevertheless, like most others, built upon a radical mistake. Two texts are jumbled together, having no reference to the same thing: and this makes out the doctrine. Well, upon this principle we will help Universalism, and prove that oxen as well as men will be saved: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn," "for of such is the kingdom of heaven." This is all scripture, just as much as the other; and about as much in connection.

In the first text, (Math. 5. 17, 18.) the Saviour testifies that he came to fulfill the law and the prophets; that is, he came to be the great antitype, to which all the sacrifices and offerings in the law pointed; and to verify the predictions of all the prophets concerning himself; and he also says, that "not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled:" that is, till all the types and predictions were fulfilled which referred to him. This has no reference to any other character than the Lord Jesus Christ, and he did fulfill every jot and tittle of that law in his own person. Hence that law is not left for us to fulfill; for Christ himself came to fulfill it, and "he finished the work God gave him to do," (Jo. 17, 4,) when he "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." (Col. 2. 14.) But there is another *law*, which is commonly called the moral law, or the law which binds moral obligations between man and man. "Love is the fulfilling of *this law;*" and every man is morally bound to *fulfill* it; yet hundreds and thousands break it, and live in the open violation of it, all their lives; and consequently die and go into eternity without fulfilling the law of love: and as Universalists contend that this law is eternal, (i. e. and-

less,) of course then the penalty for disobeying it must also be eternal, (for the penalty, in one sense, is a component part of the law,) and thus *Universalism is against itself*,—perfectly stranded, and caught in the meshes of its own net. Yes, says Paul: "If any man *love not* the Lord Jesus Christ, (i. e. does not fulfill the law of love,) let him be ACCURSED when the Lord shall come;" (1 Cor. 16. 22.) that is, let him receive the *eternal penalty* necessarily annexed to this *eternal law*."

So Universalists loose much, but gain nothing by this argument; for James says: "Whoso shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (Jam. 2. 10.) Hence no individual can be said truly, and strictly to fulfill the *Royal law*, who ever breaks a single point; but Christ could be said to fulfill the law concerning him, from the fact that he never transgressed in a single instance.

16. Math. 5. 44, 45. **But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that you may be the children of your father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust.**

Universalists consider this passage strong ground in their favor; but it is as far from Universalism as the north is from the south. The Saviour here refers only to temporal things, and not to those things which relate to God's spiritual or moral government. This is clear, from the fact that he gives us a sample of God's goodness to his enemies: "He maketh his *sun* to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth *rain* on the just, and on the unjust."

God is thus good to the wicked, in giving them the means by which they can procure a living: but suppose they will not cultivate the soil, and improve the early

and latter rains, which God so richly pours down upon the earth; will God keep them from starving? No, for Solomon says: "The sluggard will not plow by reason of the cold, therefore he shall beg for bread in harvest and *have nothing*." (Prov. 20. 4.) And under the gospel dispensation, Paul taught the same doctrine: "If any man will not work neither shall he eat; (2 Thess. 3. 10.) and Paul would not pity him, neither would the Lord, if he should starve to death. Thus we are to imitate our father in heaven: we are to give our enemies food and raiment, if they stand in need; but if they will not receive them, it is their own fault if they perish, and not ours. And here again Universalism is completely *against itself*, by making the dealings of God in time, illustrative of his dealings with reference to eternity. For upon this principle, just as certain as God will let a man starve, unless he attend to the means appointed in nature to procure him a living, just so certain will he let him die a second and eternal death, if he refuse to make use of the means of grace, in order to secure the incorruptible inheritance. This, Universalists are compelled to admit, or forever abandon their application of the above text. They tell us that God has always done good to the wicked, and we are to imitate him in every thing. Then accordingly, if we pour down fire and brimstone upon our enemies' heads, till we have consumed them to ashes, we are doing them *good!* Should we send an army upon them and hew them in pieces, as did God with the Jews, we would only be giving them an exhibition of our long suffering and tender mercy! Should we cause them even to "die *without* MERCY under two or three witnesses;" and punish them with an *everlasting* DESTRUCTION; it is but another name for goodness, philanthropy, or benevolence!

But Universalists would tell us, we were not doing our enemies good, by pursuing this course; yet according to their doctrine, God had a thousand times, and will still do the wicked *good* in this very way, if his word is to be regarded.

But suppose we admit, (which we cheerfully do, in one sense,) that God *is* good to the wicked in a moral point of view, it does nothing for Universalism; for he *is* just as *good now* as he ever will be; yet, notwithstanding his present goodness, thousands live the most wretched and miserable lives, and die the most degraded and infamous deaths, and thus go into eternity a heap of moral corruption: and unless God should get more *benevolent* in the future, than he is now, they must necessarily remain damned eternally.

God loves his enemies as long as there is any prospect of their salvation: but when they become incorrigible, he gives them over to hardness of heart, and a reprobate mind, to believe a lie and be damned; which he would not do if he continued to LOVE them.

But 1. He has no regard for such characters. Proof: "I REGARDED *them not*, saith the Lord." (Heb. 8. 9.)

2. He will show them no mercy. Proof: "He that made them, *will not have* MERCY *upon them*." (Is. 27. 11.)

3. They shall be forever debarred from his favor.—Proof: "He that formed them, *will show them* NO FAVOR." (Ibid.)

4. God *hates* them. Proof: "Thou HATEST all workers of iniquity." (Ps. 5. 5.) "The Lord trieth the righteous: but the wicked, and him that loveth violence, his soul HATETH." (Ps. 11. 5.)

5. He *despises* them. Proof: "Thou hast put them to shame; because God hath DESPISED them." (Ps. 53. 5.) "And hath DESPISED in the *indignation* of his *anger*, the king and the priest." [Lam. 2. 6.]

6. God *abhors* them. Proof: "When the Lord saw it he ABHORRED them." [Deu. 32. 19.]

Here then we have the plain word of God, concerning the wicked, who delight in working abominations; that he *regards* them not,—that he will not have *mercy* upon them,—that he will show them no *favor*,—that he *hates* them,—that he *despises* them, and that he *abhors* them!! If this is the happiness of Universalism, "Come not thou, *my soul*, into its secrets."

17. Math. 22. 30. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

Luke 20. 34–36. The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

1. The principal point in these texts relied on as positive proof in favor of Universalism, is the phrase:—"*They are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.*" But does this prove the doctrine? Let us examine it. Who are "*they*" that are equal unto the angels? and who are "*they*" that are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection? This is an important inquiry; and one upon which the whole issue must turn. Universalists take the position that "*they*" embrace the whole human family; but the Saviour takes the ground that ☞"*they who shall be accounted* WORTHY to OBTAIN *that world*," are the characters who "are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Who shall we believe? "They that shall be ACCOUNTED WORTHY to OBTAIN that world," proves positively that some will not be accounted worthy: although *some* Universalists have tried in vain to reconcile such language, with the assumption that *all* will be accounted worthy! But he who can get *low* enough, to take such a position, is too far gone to be reasoned with. Reader, how would you understand such a phrase as this? "They that were *accounted worthy* were admitted into the feast." Would you not understand that some *were not accounted worthy*? Most certainly you would,

if you possessed any thing like a reasonable share of that most valuable article, called *common sense*. The Saviour shows, that to be counted worthy of a thing, requires action and preparation on our part: "Watch ye therefore, and pray always, *that ye may be* ACCOUNTED WORTHY." [Luke 21. 36.] Paul tells the Thessalonians, that they had endured tribulation and persecution, "*That ye may* [says he] be COUNTED WORTHY of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer." [2. Thes. 1. 5.] Thus the phrase "*counted worthy*" is proved by Christ and the apostles, to presuppose a personal preparation. This is *Universalism against itself*, No. 1.

2. We remarked that only *some* Universalists took the above ground; for it is true that the most talented men amongst them do not take it; but they tell us, that the phrase "*counted worthy*" is omitted by Matthew and Mark in recording the same conversation; and mentioned only by Luke: hence it must have been a matter of little importance, or Matthew and Mark would not have omitted it! But we now turn their own logic against them, and let them hang, like Haman, upon the gallows they have erected for Mordecai. The very originators of this quibble, build their whole argument upon the phrase: "they are the children of God, *being* the children of the resurrection." This however must have been a matter of little or no importance, themselves being judges; for Matthew and Mark have omitted that phrase altogether. Yes, Matthew and Mark have both omitted the very foundation upon which they build their whole theory!—Why not then be honest—be consistent, and give it up at once, and not hang on to such a miserable theory which requires them to resort to such miserable logic to sustain it. This counts, *Universalism against itself*, No. 2.

3. But what is to be done with the phrase: "they are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection?" Does it prove Universalism. We shall show that it does not. And first we remark, that we *believe* it; notwithstanding Luke is alone; just as much as though *he had Matthew*, Mark and John to back him. But sup-

pose we should admit that all mankind are to be children of God, being the children of the resurrection; does it follow that they will all be holy and happy? By no means; for, according to Universalism, *All men* now are the children of God: yet myriads have lived and died sinners; guilty, miserable and condemned. Where then goes their logic? for they can be the children of God in the resurrection, and be sinful and miserable, just upon the same principle that they can be here; and God can then destroy them with fire and brimstone, just as consistently as he once did his dear children who lived in the city of Sodom. Mark this down, *Universalism against itself*, No. 3.

4. But Universalists are hereby informed, if they never knew it before, that the scriptures speak of *two resurrections;* one for those who die in Christ, and the other for those who die in their sins: one for the just, and the other for the unjust: one to life, and the other to condemnation. The first of these is to be *obtained* by the christian character, we form in this life; and is called "*the resurrection of the dead.*" Paul suffered the loss of all things, as he declares, "If by any means I might attain unto *the resurrection* of the dead." [Ph. 3. 11.]—This must have been *the resurrection* of the just, or the *first resurrection*, as he would have obtained the other without any exertion whatever to serve the Lord. It is the same resurrection, for which Paul was striving, as the one spoken of in Heb. 11. 35. "Women received their children raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; *that they might obtain a better resurrection.*" This corresponds precisely with the passage in Luke: "They that shall be *counted worthy to* OBTAIN that world, and *the resurrection* of the dead." Mark that word *obtain*, and then read again Heb. 11. 35. "others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might OBTAIN *a better resurrection.*" The very best thing Universalists have ever said upon this text, in order to evade the difficulty which it manifestly presents to their doctrine, is, that the better resurrection is to be

understood, as *better* than the resurrection of the *child* spoken of in the first part of that verse. Admit it, what follows? Why, had they not held fast their in rity, they would not have obtained a better resurrec than the children experienced; which was a resurrec to a state of sin, suffering, corruption and death. *l versalism against itself*, No. 4.

Now since Paul labored to obtain "*the resurrectio the dead*," and others suffered cruel persecutions " they might *obtain a better resurrection*" than the one t would have obtained, had they not suffered; it foll hence, that "they which shall be *counted worthy to ob* that world, and *the resurrection*," has reference onl the "*resurrection of the just*," or the "*first* resurrecti which Paul labored to *obtain;* or the "*better* resurrecti which the martyrs considered they had to *obtain*, by h ing out faithful to the end. Hence we read concer them: "These all died *in faith;*" [Heb. 11. 12.] an this reason, "God hath prepared for them *a city*," [v 16.] Not the city of Jerusalem, for that they did obtain: but it was "a city which hath foundations, wl builder and maker is God." [verse 10.] Those t who by their faithfulness obtain that city, and the be resurrection, will be the ones who "shall be cou WORTHY TO OBTAIN *that world and the resurrectio the dead*."

5. If Universalists could prove that all mankind w be *in the resurrection*, here referred to; it would no low that all would be the children of the resurrectio Mark that! The Saviour informs us, that "the *good* are the CHILDREN of the KINGDOM," and the angels, " gather *out of his kingdom* all things that *offend* and t which *do iniquity*." [Math. 13. 38, 41.] Thus we cover, that some who are in the kingdom, are not good seed, and consequently are not the "*children o kingdom*." On the same principle many may be in resurrection, who are not the CHILDREN OF THE RE RECTION, because they are not the GOOD SEED OF KINGDOM. Put this down, Universalism against i No. 5.

6. But supposing we explain this whole passage as Universalists are in the habit of doing with texts as pointed and as literal as this. 1. Then we will understand, "this world" and "that world," to mean the Jewish and Christian dispensations, as Universalists understand and interpret Math. 12. 32. Mark that! (The very way they will prove "this world" and "that world" to mean this, and the future state of existence in this proof-text; I can prove "this world and that which is to come"—[Math. 12. 32] to mean the same thing, which kills Universalism dead.) 2. "Neither marry nor are given in marriage," refers to the Catholic priests; and "the resurrection from the dead," which they are to obtain in order to this state of celibacy, means either conversion, (as Universalists interpret John 5. 29.) or being exalted to the priest's office. 3. "They are equal unto the angels" "in heaven," signifies that they are equal unto the *Roman soldiers* in *Jerusalem;* (as Universalists interpret Math. 25. 31.) And 4. "Neither can they die any more," means that the Catholic priests who are under the absolute dominion of the Pope, dare never renounce their faith, and apostatize from Catholicism. I challenge Universalists to refute this exposition; for if they do, they will refute themselves: because it is only a fair sample of their own method of interpreting numerous passages which oppose their theory. This is *Universalism against itself*, No. 6.

Here we have the complete advantage of these heroes, and it is impossible for them to help themselves: but still we will not take it. The fair thing, and the most obvious meaning, is all we ask; and this we can, and will have.

7. It is admitted, according to the Universalist's application of this text, that "*this world*" means this state of existence. We will now quote another text with this definition before us: "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of *this world*," (Math. 13. 40.) i. e. in the end of this state of existence, or the end of time! Then, (Universalists are compelled to admit,) will be the separation of the righteous from the wicked. *Universalism against itself*, No. 7.

8. They admit that the word *resurrection*, means coming forth to the immortal state of existence. We admit the same. Then we read: "They that have done good, [shall come forth] to the *resurrection* of life; and they that have done evil to the *resurrection* of *damnation*." (John 5. 29.) Put this down, *Universalism against itself*, No. 8.

9. *Angels*, signify immortal spirits of light. This they admit without hesitancy. Then we read: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his *angels*, [not the Roman soldiers,] and then he shall reward every man according to his works." (Math. 16. 27.) This counts *Universalism against itself*, No. 9.

10. They admit also that *heaven* means the immortal state of bliss. This admission will forever prove fatal to their theory; for the Saviour says: "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your REWARD *in* HEAVEN." [Math. 5. 12.]

Here then, we take our leave of this *proof-text*, and leave it as it is, directly opposed to Universalism, and Universalism opposed to itself ten times, in bringing it into its service.

18. Luke 2. 10, 11. And the angel said unto them: fear not, for behold I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people; for unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

1. It is one thing to bring good tidings of great joy *to* a man, and it is another thing for him to accept them. This can be seen with half an eye. Twelve men are sentenced to the penitentiary during life; but after a few years the governor pardons them. A messenger is despatched to bear the good news to the unhappy convicts. The prison doors fly open, and he proclaims in their ears, as did the angel: Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to you twelve; for the *governor has* this day signed your pardon, and you now

have the privilege of being released from your confinement! Six of them gladly receive his word, obey the call and come out of the prison: but the other six are wholly indifferent about the matter, and contend that the governor is so good and so benevolent, he would not see them die there; but will finally come and carry them out; and hence it is no difference whether they go out or not. They consequently keep putting the matter off until they die; and thus they never enjoy the benefit of the glad tidings which were brought to them from the governor. So the apostles were sent forth to bear good tidings of great joy to all people. It was also foretold by the prophet, and quoted by Paul: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace; and bring *glad tidings* of good things." [Rom. 10. 15.] But who ever heard of the apostles telling men, that these good tidings of great joy which they preached, would benefit them without their being accepted? Invariably wherever they went they proclaimed this gospel, upon the conditions that man would accept and obey it. But no such good tidings as Universalists preach, was ever proclaimed to sinners, by any apostle or evangelist of the Lord.

2. But are Universalists certain that *all people*, means the whole human family? Dare they risk their salvation upon it? We will see: "And the Lord shall scatter thee among *all people*." [Deu. 28. 64.] Does *all people* here signify the entire race of Adam? If so, who were these Jews that were to be scattered among them?—Again: "The Jews gathered themselves together in their cities, throughout all the provinces of the King Ahasuerus, to lay hand on such as sought their hurt; and no man could withstand them, for the fear of them fell upon *all people*." [Est. 9. 2.] Did the fear of the Jews fall upon the whole human family, when a thousandth part of them was not in existence? Thus we may have a thousand probabilities that Universalism is false, where there is one in its favor. Once more: "And for the majesty that he gave him, *all people*, nations and languages

trembled and feared before him." [Dan. 5. 19.] Did the entire race of Adam, without an exception, fear and tremble before Nebuchadnezzar? Did Universalists fear and tremble before him? If not, then they are no part of *all people;* and therefore are not embraced in *their Universal Salvation!* Here, then Universalism must resort to some other foundation, or be "like a city broken down and without walls."

19. John 1. 29. Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

1. This text comes far short of proving Universalism. If Christ should take away but *one man's sins*, it would be the sin of the world, as it would not be the sin of the church nor any thing else. He does not say, behold the Lamb of God that taketh away all the sins of the world! This would make the matter quite different. Sins are taken away only by forgiveness; and as forgiveness of sins was preached by the apostles to all nations, at all times, invariably, and only upon the condition of submitting to the gospel, it follows that those who will not submit to the gospel, but persist in their rebellion against God until they die in their sins, will never be forgiven; and consequently the sins of such individuals Christ will never take away. Christ has plainly and positively taught that some men's sins will not be forgiven. "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly father forgive your trespasses." [Math. 6. 15.] Some men live all their lives with bitter enmity in their hearts towards their fellow men, and die without forgiving them! If the Saviour's words are to be believed, such characters will not be forgiven; and consequently Christ will not take away their sins.

2. But Universalists admit enough, by quoting this text, to condemn their theory forever. They must necessarily admit that "*the world*" means the whole human family; for unless it mean this, why talk about it proving *Universalism*. Having now learned the signification of

"*the world*," we will read another text. "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commands all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day, in the which *he will judge* THE WORLD," i. e. the *whole human family*. This judgment (mark it) was to be sometime in the future: "*will* judge," not *has* judged, *is* judging and *will* judge the world! But *the world*,—the whole human family, *will* be judged at some future period: which cannot be till the *resurrection of the dead*, when the entire posterity of Adam shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ. This one admission not only gives us *Universalism against itself*, but sweeps it into nonentity; and its advocates must leave the sinking ship, or go down with it to the bottom of the ocean.

20. John 4. 42. We have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.

1 John 4. 14. We have seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.

1. Universalists quote these texts, and then ask with great assurance: Can Christ be the Saviour of the world, and the world not be saved? We answer yes, and we will make Universalists admit it, in spite of all they can say or do. Christ was the Saviour of the world 1800 years ago, (for the text speaks of him thus in the present tense.) Yet the world was not then saved. He has been the Saviour of the world ever since, and there has never been a time when the world was saved; and upon the same principle, he may be the Saviour of the world till the day of eternity, and the world never be saved. If Christ can be the Saviour of the world at one time, and the world not saved, it will require more logic than Universalists possess, to prove that he may not be the Saviour of the world at any other, and at all other times, and *yet the world* remain unsaved. If the fact

that Christ is the Saviour of the world will ever save the world, why will it not do the work at once and have done with it.

2. Universalists admit that none are now saved, (notwithstanding Christ is now the Saviour of the world,) only such as submit to his government; and as "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," [Heb. 13. 8.] it follows that none will ever be saved, only on this principle. And as in eternity faith is swallowed up in sight; and obedience to the commands of the gospel cannot be attended to; it follows that they cannot be saved there. I am aware that some Universalists contend that the commands which are not obeyed here, will be obeyed in the future state of being. This however is impossible. Will the wicked be *baptized*, and eat the *Lord's supper* in eternity? Will they "meet together on the *first day of the week*" in eternity, and "exhort one another, and so much the more as they see the day approaching?" Will they "feed the *hungry*, and clothe the *naked*," in eternity?! Will they "visit the *fatherless* and the *widows*" in eternity?!! And finally; will they "work while it is called *to-day*" in eternity?!! Does the apostle refer to eternity, when he says, "*now* is the accepted time, and now is the day of salvation?"

3. "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." Universalists ask: Will not Christ do the work for which he was sent? We ask in return: Was not Christ sent to make all men love one another in this life? Yes. Do they love one another? No. Christ came to cause many things to be done, that are not done, nor never will be to all eternity. For instance: he came to make men love their wives; yet some men do not love their wives, till they go into eternity: and they cannot love them there; for that relation will no more be known: "they will neither marry nor be given in marriage;" hence it will never be done at all. Again we read: "For the Son of man is come to seek and save that which was lost." [Luke 19. 10.] Did Christ come to save men *with respect* to eternity, or only with respect to time?

If you say with respect to time only: then those passages which speak of Christ as the Saviour of the world, will not apply to eternity, and consequently have nothing to do with Universalism, for all know that the world is not saved in time You may mark this down, *Universalism against itself*, No. 1.

But if you say he came to save men with respect to eternity; then they were lost with respect to eternity, for he came to seek and to save that which was lost.—And as they were eternally lost without Christ coming to save them, then it must have been on account of their sins; and if men can act here in time, so as to lose themselves in eternity: then, upon the same principle, if they are saved in eternity, it must be by their conduct in this life. Thus the old ship BALLOU runs aground just here. This counts *Universalism against itself*, No. 2.

4. As Christ came the first time to save men from their sins, they must be saved here in this life, or remain lost forever; for he will come the second time to judge the world, and not to save it. The Father will not send his Son twice upon the same errand, be assured; and those who put off being saved from their sins, till the Lord comes to raise the dead and judge the world, will find themselves eternally too late, unless it so turns out that Christ comes twice for the same thing.

5. As regards those passages which speak of Christ as the Saviour of the world: we have them all explained by another text: "For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him *might be saved*." [John 3. 17.] The word "*might*," explains the whole matter. This we understand to be the sense, in which Christ is the Saviour of the world.—Christ has made an atonement, and ordained a system of salvation by which the world *might* be saved, if they would. The word *might*, shows that men have an opportunity to be saved, and that they may be, if they choose; and also, that they may be damned if they prefer it. The word *might* is frequently used in this sense.—The Saviour says: "For judgment am I come into this

world; that they which see not *might* see, and that they which see *might* be made blind." [John 9. 39.]

This will suffice for the present, to show the candid reader, that men may be saved if they choose; and in this sense only is Christ the Saviour of the world.

21. John 6. 39. And this is the Father's will that sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.

Before this can be made to favor Universalism, two things must be proved: 1. That it is not in the power of man to frustrate the will of God; And 2. That the whole human family are given to Christ in the sense here intended. Neither of these can be proved.

1. The will of God is not always done. Proof: "This is the *will of God* even your *sanctification*, that ye should *abstain* from *fornication;*—that no man *go beyond* and *defraud* his brother in *any matter*." [1 Thess. 4. 3–6.] Is the will of God always done in these respects? Again: "*Pray without ceasing*, and in *every thing give thanks;* for this is the *will of God* in Christ Jesus concerning you." [1 Thess. 5. 17, 18.] Dare Universalists read this text, and say, the will of God is always done? The reason why the will of God is not always done; is because it belongs to man to do, and he does just as he feels disposed. The Saviour says: "Not every one that sayeth unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth the will of my Father* which is in heaven." [Math. 7. 21.] "Whosoever shall *do the will of my Father* which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." [Math. 12. 50.] "The world passeth away, and the lusts thereof; but he that *doeth the will of God*, abideth forever." [1 Jo. 2. 17.] "For so is the *will of God*, that with WELL DOING, ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." [1 Pet. 2. 15.] "Now we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a

worshiper of God, and DOETH HIS WILL; him he heareth." [John 9. 31.] The Saviour says to Jerusalem: "How often WOULD I have gathered the children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings; and ye WOULD NOT." [Luke 13. 34.] From these texts we discover, that as far as concerns the happiness of man, the will of God is conditional, and depends upon human conduct for its accomplishment.

2. Are the whole human family given to Christ in the sense of this text. We think not. Who is it that is given to Christ, whom he will raise up at the last day? The context will decide: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and *believeth* on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise *him* up at the last day." [Verse 40.] Thus the text has reference to those who are given to Christ in a spiritual sense, which are *believers*, and not the *world*. Proof: "I pray not for the WORLD, but for them which thou hast GIVEN me." [John 17. 9.] Thus we learn that believers are the ones who are given to Christ in a spiritual sense, and he will raise such up at the last day, if they hold out faithful in doing the will of God. (See also examination of Math. 1. 21.)

But *Universalism is against itself* in two respects, in its application of this text. 1. It is admitted that *lose* refers to eternity, and means an endless separation from God. This must be its meaning negatively, for they quote it to disprove that very doctrine! It cannot mean the destruction of Jerusalem, for then Universalists would be building up with one hand, and tearing down with the other, as they acknowledge many were lost at that siege. Hence it must necessarily refer to eternity.—Now is it not a little singular, that the Saviour should keep talking about men being eternally lost; and that it was the will of the father that none should be thus eternally *lost;* and in the next verse he tells them, that in order that the will of God may stand; and that they may escape being finally *lost*, they must believe on the Son; and promises to raise such characters up to himself at

the last day;—is it not singular, I ask, that the Saviour should thus talk about men being eternally *lost*, as Universalists have to admit he did, and yet such an idea never entered into the mind of God; and no sinner was ever in any danger of such a thing, since the foundation of the world! But as they thus admit the word *lose* to signify an eternal separation from GOD; we will read another text with this definition: "Those that thou hast given me I have kept: and none of them is LOST, but the *son of perdition*." [Jo. 17. 12.] Notwithstanding the text, upon which Universalists build their doctrine, declares, that it was the Father's will that of all he had given Christ, none should be eternally lost: Yet the Saviour declares as above quoted, that out of the number given him *one was lost*,—the son of perdition, and in another place we read that he went "to his own place," [Ac. 1. 25.] and the Saviour declares concerning him: "Good were it for that man, if he had never been born." [Mark 14. 21.]

2. They admit that "THE LAST DAY," refers to the resurrection. Grant it. Then we read: "The word that I have spoken, the same shall JUDGE him in THE LAST DAY." (Jo. 12. 48.) This admission proves the judgment day, at the resurrection of the dead: and thus Universalists renounce their doctrine, every time they quote this text to sustain it.

22. John 12. 32. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw* all men unto me.

John 6. 37. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.

Before Universalists can make these texts favor their doctrine, they must prove six things.

1. That the *drawing* here referred to is compulsatory.

2. That it is to be accomplished in eternity, and not *in time*.

That the lifting up of Christ from the earth, here
ed to, has not yet been accomplished, and will not
l the resurrection of the dead.
That *all men* means the whole human family.
That the whole human family are given to Christ
sense of this second text; and
That "*will draw*" and "*shall come*" are uncondi-
; or that there is not an *if* implied, as in the pro-
to Abraham.
is must all be done before these texts will favor
ersalism; and a failure in any one of these six points
ys their argument. Let us now examine them:
The word *draw* is used in the sense of *invite*, and
cannot be compulsatory. We have this word ex-
ed by the Saviour: "No man can come unto me
t the Father which hath sent me *draw* him." [Jo. 6.
Now how is this drawing to be effected? Read
ext verse: "It is written in the prophets: And they
all be *taught* of God. Every man therefore that
heard, and hath *learned* of the father, cometh unto
Thus it is that Christ *draws* men,—by teaching,
g, and inviting them unto himself.
This *drawing* is to be effected here in time; because
men are to be taught of God, and learn the will of
ther; and
Because Christ has been already lifted up from the
, ever since he rose from the dead. It cannot mean
Christ will be lifted up from the earth at the resur-
n of the dead; for then he will come from heaven,
be lifted up; but to lift up the saints, or those that
ather hath drawn to him by teaching; as he de-
: "No man can come to me except the father
hath sent me *draw* him, and I will *raise him up*
last day."
All men does not necessarily mean the whole hu-
family. Universalists cannot prove that it has this
ing in any passage in the bible, except when it
s of God as the creator of *all men*. A few samples
be given.

"And ye shall be hated of *all men* for my name's sake." [Math. 10. 22.] Did the entire race of Adam hate the apostles? Will Universalists acknowledge that they hate the apostles? If not, will they give up their 'ism? "*All men* counted John, that he was a prophet." [Mark 11. 32.] Did the whole human family count John a prophet; when not one millionth part of them ever saw him, or knew any thing about him. Once more: "Many of them also which used curious arts, brought their books together, and burned them before *all men*." [Ac. 19. 19.] Did Universalists see them burn their books? If not, then they are no part of *all men*, and will not therefore be *drawn* to Christ.

5. The whole human family are not given to him in the sense here intended. If the phrase, "all that the Father giveth me," is to be understood in the sense of dominion and power, and not in the sense of spiritual relation, then the cattle upon a thousand hills will consequently be saved: for they belong to the Father; and Christ says: "All things that the Father hath are mine." [Jo. 17. 18.] (See also examination of John 6. 39.)

6. "*Will*" is frequently used conditionally; and so it undoubtedly is in this case: "I will draw all men unto me," i. e. if they will come. (See 1 Sam. 23. 11–13.) "*Shall come*," is frequently used in the sense of *may come*, or *shall have the privilege of coming if they choose*. This is a common mode of speech. The father said to his two sons, "Stay here till to-morrow, and then you *shall* come to the feast," i. e. you may come. Thus we understand the text; "All that the Father giveth me *shall come* to me," i. e. may come if they are disposed; and in Revelations, we have a corresponding text: "Let him that is athirst *come*. and whosoever *will*, let him take the water of life freely." [Rev. 22. 17.]

But suppose we should admit that Christ will be lifted up at the general resurrection; and that there, and then, he will *draw* all men unto him; and that *draw* is to be understood as compulsatory; and that *all men* means the *whole* human family, what will Universalists gain by it?

Just nothing at all; for they will then be drawn before the judgment seat; and punished (if they belong with the goats) with an everlasting destruction from his presence, and from the glory of his power. But says one: those that come to him, he declares, he will in no wise cast out. True enough: but *coming*, and being *drawed*, or *dragged* to him, are two things vastly different. He does not say: He that is *dragged* to me, I will in no wise cast out. But "*he that comes;*" showing plainly that it is conditional; and here again we have *Universalism against itself;* for whilst one system teaches, that those who *come* to Christ, will be saved; the other teaches, that they will be saved whether they *come* or not,—unconditionally. Yes; if they will not come, no difference, only wait till the resurrection, and Christ will *draw* them, or *drag* them to him, which will answer the purpose just as well, as though they had voluntarily *come* to him.

23. John 17. 2, 3. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him; and this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

Before Universalists can claim this text, they must prove five things.

1. That *all flesh* means the whole human family and nothing else. This they cannot do, for *all flesh* embraces beasts, as well as men. Proof: "And of every living thing of *all flesh*, two of every sort, shalt thou bring into the ark,—of *fowls* after their kind, and of *cattle* after their kind; and of every *creeping thing* of the earth after his kind." (Gen. 6. 19, 20.) Thus, if the "*all flesh*," of this text, is to have eternal life, we will have the company of *fowls*, *cattle*, and *creeping things* in heaven; for Christ has power over all flesh in this very sense; for he says: "*All power* is given unto me in heaven, and in earth."

(Math. 28. 18.) But if it be contended that *all* j
to be confined exclusively to the human specie
Universalists cannot prove that it means the thou
part of them. Proof: "And behold I, even I do b
flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy *all*
(Gen. 6. 17.) Do Universalists believe that the
race of Adam was destroyed in the flood? No.
will tell us, it had reference to those only who li
that time on the earth. Yes, and not to *all* of th
an unlimited sense; for eight persons, out of the *al*
were saved alive in the ark. Here Universalism
an insurmountable barrier.

2. They must prove that "*as many* as thou has
him," means the *all flesh*, over which Christ had
This cannot be done. The context is opposed t
"I pray not for the world; but for them which th
given me." (verse 9.) If the idea of Universali
correct, that he is to give eternal life to all flesh;
should read thus: As thou hast given him powe
all flesh that he should give them eternal life: not
should give eternal life to *as many* as thou hast
him. This word *as many*, shows plainly that som
not included, and consequently that some were not
to Christ in this sense. For example, when Paul
"*As many* as are of the works of the law, are unc
curse," (Gal. 3. 10.) does it not incontrovertibly
that some were not of the works of the law? Ye
all the christians of that age were exceptions; and
"*as many* as thou hast given him," proves just as c
sively, that some were not given to him, in the se
tended in this text. (See examination of Math. 1

3. They must prove that because Christ will giv
eternal life, therefore, they will be certain to pos
This they cannot do; for I can prove that God h
en men things which they never possessed, becaus
would not have them. For example, God gave
children of Israel the land of Canaan; and yet b
of their disobedience they never possessed it. I
"Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the w

nem, that I would not bring them into the land which I *had given* them." [Ezek. 20. 15.]

4. They must prove that *eternal life* means the joys of the immortal state, and not the spiritual life of the christian here in time. This we admit; but still they are bound to prove it, and whenever they do this, they annihilate their doctrine; for *eternal life* is spoken of in more than twenty passages of scripture, where it is suspended upon the conditions of faith and obedience. One example will suffice for the present: "FIGHT *the good fight of faith and* LAY HOLD *on* ETERNAL LIFE." (1 Tim. 6. 12.) Every time a Universalist quotes this text, just make him prove that eternal *eternal life* refers to the future state, and you have *Universalism against itself.*

5. They must prove that *all men*, universally, will know God, as they admit this to be an indispensable pre-requisite to the enjoyment of *eternal life*. This they cannot do. They quote Heb. 8. 11. "All shall know me from the least to the greatest," but this does not prove the point, as we shall show, when we come to examine that text.

Let us now see what it is, scripturally to know God: "Awake to righteousness and sin not, for some have not the *knowledge* of God." [1. Cor. 15. 34.] But why have they not the knowledge of God? Because, says the apostle: "He that *knoweth* God, *heareth* us." (John 4. 6.) Again: "They profess that they *know* God, but in works they deny him, being abominable, disobedient, and unto every *good work reprobate*." [Tit. 1. 16.] Once more: "Hereby we do know that we *know him, if we keep his commandments*. He that saith I *know* him, and *keepeth not his commandments*, is a *liar*, and the truth is not in him." [1 John 2. 3, 4.] And finally: what will become of those that know not God? (See 2 Thess. 1. 7-9.)—Now as Universalists admit that none can have eternal life, only such as *know* God; here again we have *Universalism against itself;* for the apostles have positively taught that none can know God, only those who keep his commandments; and if a Universalist should say he could know God, without keeping his commandments, the

apostle John tells him, "he is a *liar*, and the *truth* is not *in him*."

24. Acts. 3. 20, 21. And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.

This text is considered by Universalists strong ground in their favor. But we think, when it once passes the ordeal of critical investigation, it will be discovered to have no more the appearance of Universalism, than those already examined.

1. The whole force of the argument depends upon the word *restitution* or *restoration*. It cannot mean that the whole human family will be made holy and happy; for we have examined the testimony of all the prophets, upon this subject, and not one of them has testified in favor of Universalism. Hence, this one argument is sufficient to convince the candid and intelligent reader, that the apostle Peter did not design to teach Universalism, for he speaks only of the "restitution of all things, WHICH *God hath spoken* by the mouth of all his holy prophets;" and as God did not speak of universal salvation by the mouth of *any* of his prophets, it follows that Peter did not think of Universalism when he uttered this sentence. If it mean salvation at all, it can only prove the salvation of the *people of God*, for they are the only ones of whom the prophets have spoken.

2. Are Universalists certain that *restitution* means salvation from sin? I think hardly. We will examine a few other texts, where the same word occurs in the original scriptures. "And Jesus answered, and said unto them; Elias truly shall first come, and *restore* all things," [Math. 17. 11.] i. e. make all things holy and happy! If John the Baptist made all things holy and happy, what

was there left for Christ to do? "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying: Lord wilt thou at this time, *restore* again the kingdom to Israel?" [Acts 1. 6.] i. e. wilt thou make the kingdom holy and happy; or save it from sin? "Then said he to the man: stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was *restored* whole like as the other." [Math. 12. 13.] i. e. was saved from sin! "After that he put his hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up; and he was *restored*, and saw every man clearly." [Mark 8. 25.] The word *restore* in all these examples, is the same as in Acts 3. 21,—*apokatasasis*. Universalists contend that the apostle designed teaching a universal reconciliation; but unfortunately for their system, he made use of the wrong word: it should have been *apokatallasso*. If the text does literally mean to restore all men; it cannot mean to take all men to heaven, for all men have never been there; and to *restore* means to take a thing back to where it once was. Universalists can prove no more by it, make the most of it, than this: that all men will be *restored*, than is, brought back again into the flesh, to be JUDGED. To restore the wicked is to bring them back to a state of *sin*, to receive their final sentence.

3. Peter gives a reason in the next verse why this *restitution* will take place. He commences it with the conjunction *for*, and you know this always brings in a reason. We shall expect now, if the apostle designed to teach Universalism, in verse 21, that the reason he assigns will correspond with it. Let us hear it any how: "*For* Moses truly said unto the fathers: a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me: him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass that every *soul* which will not hear that prophet, [shall be saved? No! no!] *shall be* DESTROYED from among the people." [Verses 22, 23.] Singular Universalism this truly! The reason Peter gives for this universal salvation is, that some *souls* will be *destroyed*!! But perhaps Peter *betters the* matter in the verses preceding this

proof text. Let us see: "*Repent* ye therefore, and *converted*, that your sins *may be blotted out*." Peter tainly was no Universalist; for had he been, he would have taught repentance, and conversion is necessar the blotting out of sins: but would have taught them he was an honest man,) that whether they repente not, it would make no difference in the out-come, fo the RESTITUTION, let a man be ever *so sinful*, and eve *impenitent*, his sins shall there and then all be blo out. This is pure unadulterated Universalism.

4. I will now present *Universalism against itsel reductio ad absurdum*. Christ came, we are informe Universalists, at the destruction of Jerusalem. The course was the restitution, or the resurrection; for heaven was to receive him till the *restitution* took pl *Then*, all things that the prophets had spoken were filled: for the Saviour says: "These be the days of geance, that *all things* which are written may be *fu ed*." [Luke 21. 22.] *Then*, all men were saved; consequently those that have since lived, are not n but some other race of beings. And Universalists hereby proved to be the very same scoffers of w Peter speaks, who should come in the last days: " ing: where is the promise of his coming? for since fathers fell asleep, (i. e. since Jerusalem was destroy all things continue as they were from the beginnin the creation." (2 Pet. 3. 4.) And their doctrine is very same old heresy which Paul advertized 1800 y ago: which teaches "that the resurrection is pas ready." [2 Tim. 2. 18.] To sum up: Universalists compelled to take one of three grounds: Either 1. give up the dogma of the coming of the Lord at the struction of Jerusalem; or 2. To contend that the r *tution* took place at that time; or 3. To give up this and confess that it does not prove their doctrine; ei of which kills Universalism. Which horn of this tri ma they will prefer is for them, and not for me to de *To say*, (which they do,) that this *restitution* is sti *ture, would be to say*, that the Lord did not come a

destruction of Jerusalem, which would be a virtual renunciation of Universalism. Here we leave the doctrine to squirm in the midst of inflexible difficulties.

25. Acts 11. 10. And this was done three times, and all were drawn up again into heaven.

This text is concerning the vision of the sheet, which Peter saw let down from heaven, full of "all manner of four footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping thing, and fowls of the air." [Acts. 10. 12.] Universalists contend, that these living creatures, represented the whole human family; and they being all taken up into heaven, proves that the whole human family will be saved. They also contend that Peter was not converted to Universalism till he saw this vision; and then the Saviour's words were fulfilled: "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." [Luke 22, 32.] We might let this all go for what it is worth,—nothing: but perhaps it is better to say a word or two, to set the matter straight, and to show that this text has nothing to do with Universalism; [i. e. for it] and that Universalists have entirely misunderstood the design of this vision. 1. Suppose we should admit that Peter was not converted to Universalism till he saw this vision; it is a little singular that he should preach Universalism in the text just examined, [Acts 3. 21,] eight years before he believed the doctrine! And as he did not then believe in Universalism but still preached the gospel, as Universalists admit, one of two things must inevitably follow: either 1. That there are two gospels divinely authorized; or 2. That Universalism is no part of the gospel; but a perversion of the gospel of Christ. Is it not one of the most singular things in all creation, that Peter preached tolerably good Universalism before he was converted; and that, in all his life afterwards, he never uttered a *single syllable in its favor!!* Universalists themselves,

with all their hawk-eyed critics, have never claimed a single scratch of Peter's pen in proof of Universalism, after his conversion. This being true, one of three things follows inevitably: either 1. That Peter was converted to Universalism; and saw that it was a dangerous doctrine in its tendency and influence, and therefore resolved not to preach it; or 2. That the reason why he never preached the doctrine after his conversion, was, because he believed in Universalism before, and was converted from it: or 3. That he never was a Universalist before, nor after his conversion, and that his conversion has reference to something else. If they admit the first, then *they* should cease preaching the doctrine; for it must be just as pernicious in its tendency now, as it was then. If they admit the second: then the same arguments that would convert Peter, and cause him to renounce Universalism, should also induce them to give it up. But if they admit the third, they give up this text. Either will answer our purpose.

2. But Peter's explanation of this vision, should be taken as soon at least, as that of Universalists. He explains it thus: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." [Acts 10. 34, 35.] All being taken up into heaven, Peter understands to signify, that all men *may be* saved, and be taken up into heaven if they choose; and not that they absolutely will. The vision was designed to show Peter that the gentiles, as well as the Jews, had a right to embrace the Gospel and be saved; and it proved effectual,—he was fully convinced by it that God was no respecter of persons; and that he would save (not every body unconditionally; but) those in every nation, who feared God, and worked righteousness. Had Peter been converted to Universalism, and for the first time been expressing his firm convictions of its truth; he certainly would not have made use of the language he did, if he ever wished his real sentiments to be known. But *he would have* expressed himself thus: "Of a truth I

perceive that God is no respecter of persons' [characters] but in every nation, he that feareth [not] God, and worketh [un]righteousness is accepted of him." This is pure, genuine, New England Universalism: and Peter was no Universalist, or he was an exceedingly poor scholar, with an education so limited, as not to be competent to convey his ideas, so that one in ten thousand could understand him.

3. But as usual, we have *Universalism against itself*, in this argument. It is admitted necessarily that HEAVEN relates to the kingdom of glory above. This admission forever condemns the doctrine; for HEAVEN is proved to be conditional in a number of places. One will suffice for the present. "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your REWARD IN HEAVEN." (Math. 5. 12.) i. e. in the *kingdom of ultimate glory*. Whenever Universalists present this argument, make them tell you what *heaven* means; and their theory of an unconditional *heaven*, tumbles into oblivion.

26. Rom. 5. 12, 18, 19. Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.

I have left out the parenthesis, and have quoted the whole connection upon which Universalists base their doctrine. But in order that this scripture be made to sustain Universalism, three things must be proved.

1. That "*all men*," and "*many*," signifies the entire race of Adam, without an exception. This they cannot do.

2. That *justification*, (verse 18,) means deliverance from sin. Here too they will fail.

3. That *shall*, (verse 19,) is to be understood in an absolute or unconditional sense; or that there is not an *if* implied, as in the promise to Abraham. (See examination of Gen. 22. 18.) At each of these points, Universalism must inevitably fail.

1. "So death passed upon *all men*." *All men* here cannot mean the whole human family, because death did not pass upon Enoch and Elijah; as they were translated to heaven without seeing death. Paul says concerning the former: "By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see *death*." (Heb. 11. 5.) Here the *all men* of Universalism is *minus* two. But Paul speaks in the past tense: "Death *passed* upon all men," not *will pass*. Hence *all men* does not necessarily mean those who now live upon the earth; for death certainly had not *passed* upon them, 1800 years before they existed! But if it must apply to the future as well as to the past, it still cannot mean a mathematical whole; for when the Lord shall come, at the resurrection, we are informed, that many will remain alive upon the earth,—in all probability *millions*. What then becomes of the absolute totality of *all men* in this verse? Death will not pass upon those who remain alive when the Lord comes, for the apostle says, "We shall not all *sleep*." (1 Cor. 15. 51.) But to evade this difficulty, it may be said, that the death here referred to, is to be understood in a moral sense, i. e. a death in sin, and not the literal death of the body. But this only makes matters worse for Universalism; for all the myriads of the human race, who have lived and died in infancy; have never died this moral death. Infants are not sinners, for "sin is the transgression of the law." [1 Jo. 3. 4.] And, "Where no law is, there is no transgression." [Rom. 4. 15.] And Universalists themselves quote the language of the Saviour, to prove that infants are perfectly *pure*, *innocent* and *uncontaminated*: "Suffer little children to come unto me, *and forbid them* not, for of such is the kingdom of heav-

en." [Mark 10. 14.] These remarks will also apply to the word *many*, [verse 19.]

2. We shall now present our views of verse 18 by paraphrasing it. "Therefore by the offence of one man, which was Adam, judgment came upon all men to the condemnation of a natural death, by which means they were taken down to the grave; even so by the righteousness or obedience of one man, who was the second Adam—the Lord from heaven, the free gift came upon all men to a justification or resuscitation to a natural life, or the resurrection from the dead." This is undoubtedly the true idea of this text. Universalists cannot disprove it, if their salvation was at stake.

3. "So by the obedience of one, *shall* many be made righteous." [Verse 19.] *Shall*, is here used conditionally; for there are many passages which teach positively, that in order to be *righteous* men must obey God. "Little children, let no man deceive you. He that *doeth righteousness, is righteous*, even as he is righteous." [1 John 3. 7.] "In every nation he that feareth God, and *worketh righteousness*, is accepted of him." [Acts 10. 35.] "Whosoever *doeth not righteousness*, is not of God." [1 John 3. 10.] "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves *servants* to *obey*, his servants ye are to whom ye *obey*, whether of sin unto death, or of *obedience unto righteousness*." (Rom. 6. 16.) Hence we understand the apostle the same as if he had said: "So by the obedience of one, SHALL many be made righteous, *if* they do righteousness." None were ever made sinners by the disobedience of Adam, only those who voluntarily acted upon the principle of disobedience which Adam introduced. This being incontrovertibly true; it follows, that none can be made righteous by the obedience of Christ, only such as voluntarily act in conformity to the example of obedience which Christ laid down. And as none were made sinners by the disobedience of Adam, in eternity; therefore none will be made righteous by the obedience of Christ only in this life. If Universalists can *prove, that those who die* unrighteous, can act upon

the example of Christ in voluntary obedience and thus become righteous in eternity; I can prove by the same logic, that those who die righteous, can after this, carry out the principle of disobedience introduced by Adam, and thus voluntarily become unrighteous! But we are not left in the dark, to infer with reference to the apostle's meaning. He throws in a verse as explanatory; to show positively that he does not design to teach Universalism. "For if by one man's offense, death reigned by one; much more THEY WHICH RECEIVE abundance of GRACE, and of the *gift* of *righteousness*, *shall reign in life* by one Jesus Christ." [Verse 17.] This then settles the controversy, and upon this text, is an end of all strife. It shows that those who receive the "*gift of righteousness*," are the ones who are made righteous by the obedience of Christ, and those who "receive abundance of *grace*," are the characters who will be saved, or "*reign in life* by one Christ Jesus." In order to know who will *reign in life*, we must know who will *receive grace*. Universalism says, that God gives grace to every body: but Peter says: "God resisteth the proud and *giveth* GRACE to the HUMBLE." (1 Pet. 5. 5.) Thus we have *Universalism against itself*. None but the *humble* can receive grace; and some are not profited by it, when they do receive it, for they have it in their power to receive it in vain: proof: "We therefore as workers together with him, beseech you also, that ye *receive not the grace of God* IN VAIN." (2 Cor. 6. 1.) They also have it in their power to fall from grace: proof: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are FALLEN FROM GRACE." (Gal. 5. 4.) They also have it in their power to lose the grace of God entirely: proof: "Follow peace with all men, and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord: looking diligently, lest any man FAIL of the GRACE of GOD." (Heb. 12. 14, 15.) From all this we draw the conclusion, that when the fifth chap. of Rom. is appealed to, Universalism has *made a mistake*, and *subpenaed* the wrong *witness*.

27. Rom. 6. 23. The wages of sin is death, but the *gift of God is eternal life* through Jesus Christ our Lord.

1. Universalists quote this text universally, to prove that the life beyond the resurrection is unconditional, because it is the *gift of God*. There is not a book of fifty pages in favor of Universalism now extant, which has not this text in it, thus applied. We take it for granted hence, that this is one of their *strong holds*. And we therefore meet them just here with "the weapons of our warfare which are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the *pulling down of strong holds*, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that *opposeth*, and *exaleth* itself against the *knowledge of God*." (2 Cor. 10. 4, 5.)—And in a very few minutes, we think the reader will discover UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF, in compelling this witness into court.

2. Does it follow, because eternal life is a *gift*, that therefore it is unconditional? Not at all, but right the reverse, as we shall now show. The word *gift* presupposes a *giver*; and the word *giver*, presupposes a *receiver*, and the word *receiver*, in connection with *giver*, presupposes *reception*, which to all intents and purposes is a *condition*. There can be no *gift* without a *giver*, and there can be no *giver*, without a *receiver;* neither can there be a *gift* possessed or enjoyed by the *receiver*, without the condition of *reception*. Hence *eternal life*, being a *gift*, is the very strongest argument imaginable, in favor of its conditionality. As certain as *eternal life* is a *gift* to men, just so certain must they *accept* it, or never have it.—Thus testifies Paul: "Fight the good fight of faith, and LAY HOLD ON, [or accept of] eternal life." (1 Tim. 6. 12.) The Saviour also testifies the same thing: "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have *eternal life*, and they are they that testify of me; but ye *will not come* unto me, that ye *might have eternal life*." (John 5. 39, 40.)

3. It is said, if eternal life be conditional, then it is a

matter of debt and credit between man and God! It is somewhat astonishing, and needs a mark of wonder or surprise, that men of sense should resort to such a miserable subterfuge. But we ought not to complain, as this is the best they have to offer. The editor of the Star is prolific in just such *diminuosities;* as the greatness of some men, consists altogether in their littleness.

But let us look at this objection: Universalists admit, and contend that the present salvation, or forgiveness of sins, is conditional; as every one knows, (who has the slightest acquaintance with Universalism,) that every passage which speaks of salvation as being conditional, they refer to the present salvation from sin, in order if possible to keep it out of eternity. Now let me ask these learned metaphysicians? Is the forgiveness of sins, a matter of debt and credit between man and God? Does man remunerate God for the benefit received, by simply submitting to the terms of pardon? But do you say, forgiveness is not a *gift!* If you do, hear Peter: "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to GIVE repentance to Israel and FORGIVENESS of sins." (Acts 5. 31.) What say you now? Cannot *eternal life* depend upon the condition of obedience, and still be a GIFT, just as much as FORGIVENESS of sins? But suppose a case: A beggar presents himself before your door, hungry, cold, and miserably clad. Your sympathies are excited for him. You prepare a suit of clothes, and spread your table with the bounties of providence. You then invite the hungry man to come in, and partake of your hospitalities as a *free gift.* But to your astonishment the man replies: If that food, which you have prepared, be a FREE GIFT, as you say: then it is unconditional, and consequently I expect to have it and enjoy it without eating it! And those garments: if I have to be to the trouble of putting them on, in order to enjoy them, it will be a matter of debt and credit between you and me; and why then talk about them as a GIFT, when you require me to pay you for them? You would be utterly *astonished at* such inconsistency: Yet, if you turn to the

"Star in the West," you will find its pages lined with just such philosophy: or, I should say, *philo-sophistry*.

4. The Saviour taught his disciples to pray: "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name:—GIVE us this day our daily bread." (Math. 6. 9, 11.)—Yet who supposes that our daily bread is to be possessed, or enjoyed, independent of us complying with the laws of nature? In fact: there cannot be such a thing as an unconditional GIFT: it is a contradiction in terms, and the very word itself, as we have shown, refutes such a hypothesis, by always carrying along with it the idea of RECEPTION, as a condition invariably to be complied with before the GIFT can be possessed or enjoyed. God sometimes gives men certain things which they never possess, from the fact that they will not *have* them. As an example of this kind, we refer to the fact of God giving the land of Canaan to the children of Israel, and for their disobedience he never let them possess it. Thus testifies the Lord by the mouth of the prophet: "Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, that I would not bring them into the *land which I had given them*." (Ezek. 20. 15.) Hence, God may GIVE men the antitype of this LAND,—the eternal Canaan,—the rest that remains for the people of God; and still they may never possess it: but, like the rebellious Israelites, forfeit their inheritance by disobedience.

5. The phrase "*through* Jesus Christ our Lord," we claim as diametrically opposed to the Universalist assumption of Unconditionality. The meaning is precisely the same as if he had said: "The gift of God is eternal life, *in obedience to* Jesus Christ our Lord." We have some reason for this claim. When Paul says: "*Through this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins," (Acts 13. 38,) does he not mean to be understood the same as if he had said: "*In obeying this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins?" Most certainly: this Universalists admit; and this being so, the whole scheme of Universalism is prostrate with the dust: for instead of the apostle teaching *what* they have always assumed,

namely: that ETERNAL LIFE is unconditional, because the gift of God; he has taught in direct opposition to it, that the gift of God is eternal life THROUGH, OR IN OBEDIENCE TO, Jesus Christ our Lord;—the same as if he had said: the GIFT of God is eternal life CONDITIONALLY.

6. The conditionality of eternal life is farther demonstrated from the preceding verse: "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end EVERLASTING LIFE," or ETERNAL LIFE, it being the same word in the Greek: *zoe aionios;* LIFE ETERNAL: and in this verse it is suspended upon the condition of "having our fruit unto holiness." No man dare assert that ETERNAL LIFE in verse 22, is not the same as ETERNAL LIFE in verse 23, which is the GIFT OF GOD. The two verses are joined together in such a manner, as to utterly exclude such an idea: the latter being given as a reason, for what the apostle had said in the former. They are united thus: "Ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end ETERNAL LIFE; FOR the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is ETERNAL LIFE THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD." The conjunction *for*, brings in the reason why ETERNAL LIFE is suspended upon the condition of having "our fruit unto holiness:" it is BECAUSE it is the GIFT OF GOD THROUGH, or in OBEDIENCE to Jesus Christ our Lord! Dare any man risk his reputation as a critic or a scholar, by assuming that the apostle in one verse, lays down the position that ETERNAL LIFE is conditional, and in the next verse gives his reason for it, but uses the same word in a sense differing infinitely from the former? If any man should possess such hardihood, I feel to pity his conscientiousness, as much as his sense of honor.

7. This same word, ETERNAL LIFE, which Universalists acknowledge refers to eternity, is used by the apostle in another connection, where it is also unanswerably proved to be conditional. "He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap LIFE ETERNAL; (Gal. 6. 8.) *zoe aionios*, the same word used in the proof-text

under examination. This cannot mean the spiritual life of the gospel which the christian enjoys here in time; for those brethren were then in possession of that life: but this *eternal life*, which they were to reap, by sowing to the spirit, was still in the future, as he declares in the next verse: "And let us not be weary in well doing; for in due season we SHALL REAP, if we faint not." This proves that the *eternal life*, which christians are to reap if they faint not, is the life of immortality, beyond the resurrection, the same as in Rom. 6. 23. Had the apostle understood this *eternal life*, as meaning no more than the present spiritual life of the christian, he would not have placed the verb in the future tense,—"we *shall reap;*" but in the present: *We do reap* every day of our lives as we go along!! From this it is certain the apostle refers to the future life; and just so certain he kills Universalism dead, by making the life to come depend upon our conduct in time. Here then we see the difference between Paul, and a Universalist. One teaches that: "In due season we shall reap, *if we faint not;*" whilst the other teaches, that "In due season we shall reap, if we faint (*or*) not!"

8. But we are told that it is contrary to reason, to talk of sowing in one place, and reaping in another. How would it look, say they, for a man to sow in Ohio, and go west of the Rocky mountains to reap his crop? This however is but an apparent difficulty, as we shall show; but we will first return the compliment by presenting a real one, for Universalism to meet if it can.

Who ever heard of a man *sowing* and *reaping*, both as he went along?—scatter a handful of seed, and reach forth his sickle immediately, and reap it before he left his tracks!! This is Universalism; but it is neither reason, common sense, nature, nor religion. But with respect to this imaginary difficulty, I pretend not to say, but that men will receive the final decision of their destiny on this earth; for they are to be recompensed at the resurrection; and the resurrection must take place on the earth where the dead are buried: and thus they will reap

the crop where they have sown the seed. But let this be as it may, men do not always in a moral point of view, or with respect to character, reap in the precise spot where they sow. A man may sow the seeds of iniquity in Europe, and before they have time to spring up and grow, he crosses the mighty deep, and in America, when time unvails his true character, he reaps the bitter fruits of his own ill doings. A man may set on foot a scheme of wickedness, which may carry the seeds of wretchedness and ruin to future ages, and distant climes. But enough of this: Universalists should be the last men to talk about God carrying things over from time to eternity, to be settled then; when according to their doctrine, notwithstanding men become sinners in time, yet God lets them remain so, as long as they live; and instead of exerting Almighty power to make them righteous where they become wicked, he lets them die in their sins, and postpones the important matter of their conversion till the resurrection of the dead: when the whole concern, which could have been settled just as well in time, will then be disposed of!!

And finally: as Universalists admit that *eternal life*, in this proof-text, refers to the future state: it follows hence, that the *death* placed in antithesis to it, must be an *eternal death*, and must also refer to the same period,—the resurrection state! Here then we leave *Universalism against itself*,—hand-cuffed perfectly, and its feet fast in the stocks; whilst we proceed to examine their next witness!!

28. Rom. 8. 19–23. For the earnest expectation of the creature, waiteth for the manifestations of the sons of God; for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be *delivered from* the bondage of corruption, into the

glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption to wit, the redemption of our body.

This portion of scripture is considered one of the strongest grounds of Universalism; and some have even gone so far as to say, that if this was the only text in the bible which appeared to favor Universalism, they would nevertheless believe the doctrine. We shall show them in a few minutes, that they would have but a slim foundation for their faith. This text has puzzled more commentators, doubtless, than any other text in the bible. We shall probably, in the few remarks we have to offer, pursue a course marked out by none of them. Not that we wish to be singular: but we wish to express our sincere convictions upon the subject, and to be honest; it is a free country, and we have a right to tell what we think, as much as any other man—even if it should cross the track of all the commentators that have ever written.

Universalists contend that the Greek word *ktisis*, here translated "*creature*," and "*creation*," signifies the whole human family. This we deny, and we proceed in the first place to disprove it. The language which the apostle makes use of, forever excludes the idea, that "*the whole creation*" means the entire posterity of Adam.—This is clear without an argument, if we simply look at his language. "For we know that the *whole creation* groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now, and *not only they*, but *ourselves also*," i. e. not only the *whole creation*, but ourselves *also;* showing most conclusively that *ourselves* was no part of this *whole creation* of which he was speaking. If this be not so, then there is no meaning in language. Suppose I should say: All that were in the house heard him say it, and not only they

but ourselves also: would it not follow most positively that *ourselves* were not in the house? Would I not be considered as talking the most unpardonable nonsense, to say: All that were in the house heard him, and *not only they*, but *ourselves also*, when *ourselves* were in the house just as much as any body else?

This one criticism leaves Universalism without hope, and without God in the world, as far as this text is concerned. Now, as we have disposed of Universalism, and have seen that this is not the meaning of the text, it remains for us to show what it does mean. But previous to this we remark, that the *creation*, or *creature*, cannot include christians, or the sons of God; because the apostle says, that the "*creature* waiteth for the manifestations of the sons of God;" not for the manifestations of itself, certainly! And it "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God;" not into the glorious liberty of itself! And again: "Not only they, [i. e. the *creation*] but ourselves *also*, who have the first fruits of the spirit." According to this: christians, or those who have the first fruits of the spirit, are no part of this *creation* upon which the apostle is treating. And if there can be a "*whole creation*," without christians; may there not, upon the same principle, be a *whole creation* without sinners? and thus have a *whole creation* of somebody else, who are called neither christians nor sinners? We shall come to the point soon. But does the whole *creation* mean the physical *creation*, or the earth we inhabit? Many excellent men, and men of erudition have taken this ground: but with due deference we beg leave to dissent from this view, and will assign our reasons. The creature is here spoken of as *groaning*, *waiting*, and *hoping*. It is contended, however, that these expressions are applied to the earth figuratively. We admit that the *waiting* may be, and no doubt is used *figuratively;* but the *groaning* cannot be; and consequently the *creation* which *groans* cannot mean the earth. The word *groan* cannot be used figuratively, for this reason. The disciples are said to take part

in this very *groaning*, which is applied to the *creation*. Read the text again: "For we know that the whole *creation groaneth and travaileth in pain* together until now; and not only they, but ourselves ALSO, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves *groan* within ourselves, waiting for the adoption to wit, the redemption of our body." Here then we have it; that the *creation groans*, and not only they, but the disciples ALSO groan. Mark that word "ALSO;" for it shows that the disciples took part in the same groaning, experienced by the *creation*, which proves that it cannot be figurative, and consequently that the *creation* cannot mean the earth. It cannot be supposed that the apostle would tell us, that the *creation groans*, and that the disciples ALSO groan, and use the word *groan* figuratively the first time, and literally the next! This would be an outrage upon all correct rules of interpretation. From this and the foregoing, we think we are justified in the following conclusions: 1. That *ktisis*, rendered *creation*, does not mean the whole human family. 2. That it does not signify christians. 3. That it does not mean sinners. 4. That it cannot signify the physical creation, or the earth: and 5. That it does, in my humble judgment, signify the *infant creation*, or that part of the human family who never arrrive at the age of accountability, and who are never in the scriptures styled either christians or sinners. Do you say this idea is a *stranger?* If so, I would say, as did Paul: "Be not forgetful to *entertain strangers;* for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." This view of the subject will harmonize with the context; whilst any other view cannot be reconciled. "The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly." That is, the *infant creation* was made subject to pain, sickness, and death; not willingly,—not by their own choice, or by their own *willful* disobedience, as is frequently the case with their parents, and as was the case with our first parents in Eden, who *willingly transgressed* the law of God, and brought this *vanity*, this sickness and death upon their innocent offspring. Thus

it was that the infant CREATION was made subject to VANITY, by reason of HIM, i. e. Adam, who by his transgression subjected them to pain and death; but not however, without a hope that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head; and then this innocent CREATION, who have GROANED and travailed in PAIN together until now, shall "ALSO" be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the CHILDREN OF GOD. They shall be partakers of the same inheritance, with the saints in light, and be brought to the enjoyment of the same *liberty*, allotted to those who, in mature age, have voluntarily been adopted into the family of God. The whole fraternity of Universalists, with all their powers of mysticism and twisticism, are challenged to refute this exposition. They cannot do it: and they dare not try it. Reader, recollect this.

But Universalists may say, (as did Mr. Flanders, with whom I discussed Universalism,) that *ktisis* cannot mean *infants;* and that it has not this meaning once in the whole bible. But here, as in other cases, *Universalism contradicts itself* in one sentence. They first tell us that *ktisis* means the *whole human family* without exception and then turn right round, and say it cannot signify *infants!!* Singular indeed. Are not *infants* a *part* of the *whole human family?* Most certainly: and thus Universalists are necessarily compelled to admit that the *creation* means all that we contend it does; for they say it means all *that*, and more too; but we challenge them to prove that it means any more. Let them put their finger upon that text of scripture, where *ktisis* means the entire posterity of Adam, or else for ever after hold their peace. But this cannot be done: and thus you see, reader, we have the entire advantage over Universalism, (as truth always has the advantage of error,) and the advocates of this contradictory system cannot help themselves. Whenever they tell you that *ktisis* means the whole human family, just admit that it means that part of the human family who die in *infancy*, and deny its *meaning* any more; and that instant Universalism is *brought to* a dead set. They cannot budge it a peg.

29. **Rom. 11. 25, 26. For I would not brethren that you should be ignorant of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own conceits: that blindness in part is happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.**

Before Universalists can claim this text in support of their doctrine, three things must be proved. 1. That "*all Israel*" means the whole Jewish nation without exception. 2. That the "*fullness of the Gentiles*" means all the Gentiles who have ever lived, are now living, or ever will live, till the end of time. And 3. That "*shall be saved*," is to be understood in an unconditional or absolute sense. Let them fail in any one of these points, and this text is immediately surrendered. We shall show that they cannot prove either of them.

1. Does "*all Israel*" mean the whole Jewish nation? 'And Moses called *all Israel*, and said unto them." [Deu. 5. 1.] Did Moses call the whole Jewish nation? when thousands of them had died and gone into eternity a short time before, and when millions of them were not yet in existence? The following texts are all of the same catalogue.

"And *all Israel* stoned him with stones." [Jos. 7. 25.]

"And Gideon made an ephod thereof, and put it in his city, even in Ophrah; and *all Israel* went thither." [Jud. 8. 27.]

"Now Eli was very old, and heard all that his sons did to *all Israel*." [1. Sam. 2. 22.]

"Now Samuel was dead, and *all Israel* had lamented him." [1. Sam. 28. 3.]

"And *all Israel* fled every one to his tent." [2. Sam. 18. 17.]

"And *all Israel* heard of the judgment which the King had judged." [1 Ki. 3. 28.]

"And the King and *all Israel* with him, offered sacrifice before the Lord. [1 Kings 8. 62.]

"And *all Israel* shall mourn for him, and bury him. (1. Kings 14. 13.)

"And David, and *all Israel* went to Jerusalem." (1 Chron. 11. 4.)

"Thus *all Israel* brought up the ark of the covenant." (1 Ch. 15. 28.)

"God smote Jeraboam, and *all Israel*." (2 Chron. 13. 15.)

"So *all Israel* shall be saved." (Rom. 11. 26.)

In not one of these texts does ALL ISRAEL mean the whole Jewish nation, without an exception: neither has it this meaning once in the bible. In each of these examples it means all, or a majority of the Jews who lived at that particular period of time to which the text refers, and no more.

So it is with this proof-text of Universalism. It refers to a certain period of time in the future: when a general conversion of the Jews, who are at that time living shall take place. Then the Deliverer, who has come out of Zion, shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

2. Does the "*fullness of the Gentiles*," mean the whole Gentile world? Universalists cannot prove that it does; from the fact that this is the only text in the bible where this phrase occur. WE have however two good reasons for the contrary belief. 1. That *all Israel*, (which is put in contrast with the *fullness of the Gentiles*,) as we have proved, does not mean an entire totality; and consequently that the other does not. 2. Because we have a phrase parallel with this, which does not include a mathematical whole. "But when the *fullness* of the *time* was come, God sent forth his son." (Gal. 4. 4.) It cannot mean when *all time* had come; for there have been more than 1800 years since! Therefore the *fullness of the Gentiles* cannot mean *all the Gentiles* without exception.

3. In the phrase *shall be saved*, there is an IF to be *understood*, because it is expressed in another place in

this same chapter; (verse 23,) and hence it is not absolute or unconditional. "And they also," says Paul, "IF they abide not in unbelief, *shall* be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again—SO all Israel shall be saved." How? Ans. "IF they abide not in unbelief."

4. *Universalism is against itself* by admitting that *saved* refers to the eternal state of existence. Let us now see whether Paul believed that all the Jews and Gentiles would be saved. "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be *saved*." [Romans 10. 1.] Why, Paul, you are a singular Universalist! to desire, and pray, and labor that Israel might be *saved* when you knew that they were just as sure of salvation without all this fuss, as with it! Again says this Universalist: "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means *save* SOME." [1 Cor. 9. 22.] What! laboring to *save some* when all are certain to be saved? Truly, this is strange Universalism. But, finally, says our Universalian apostle: "And being made perfect he [Christ] became the author of *eternal salvation*, to all them that OBEY HIM." [Heb. 5. 9.] Worse, and more of it. But once more: "Wherefore he is able also to *save* them to the uttermost [*or* EVERMORE: *polyglot margin:* surely this refers to eternity: but who?] *that come unto God by him*." [Heb. 7. 25.] Now I think Universalists will have to give up Paul, or else hunt up some "*sheet*" and get him converted; and still he might not preach any better Universalism than Peter did after his conversion.

30. Rom. 11. 36. For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

1. This is called the grand *finale* of Universalism. But it cannot prove the doctrine; for the same *all things* that are *to him*, are also *of him:* and if *to him* means *salvation*, then all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, creeping things, and fish of the sea, will surely get to heaven; for they are *all* "*of him*." This is enough to see

Universalism aside, as far as this grand *finale* is claimed in its support. But,

2. The *Pro* and *Con* of Universalism assert that God is the author of sin, and quotes this very text to prove it!! (page 81.) Now if these *all things* that are *of* God are *to* him, and if *to him* means *salvation*, and if the *Pro* and *Con* has told the truth, then *sin*, as well as all the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, will be saved in heaven with an everlasting salvation! What an *'ism* this Universal*ism* is.

3. But *Universalism is against itself* in its application of this text. We are told that all men originally came from God, and all will again in the same sense return *to* him at the resurrection. This being true, there will be no such thing as the salvation of men in heaven at all; for there will be no such beings as men in existence!—Before men were *of* God, they did not exist in any sense whatever; and consequently after they are *to* him, they will not exist, but be what they were before they were of him: viz: a part of God. Hence, Universalism, instead of teaching the endless salvation, and happiness of men; holds to nothing but the endless salvation, and happiness of God! As a man once argued, that as woman was taken originally from the side of man, she would again return at the resurrection, and form a component part of man! Thus he proved that there would be no women in heaven.

But if man is, as Universalism teaches, a part of God, then it follows that a part of God commits sin; and if a part of God is sinful, then the whole of him may be, on the same principle. And thus we have this rigmarole conglomeration of incongruities, deduced from a fair analysis of the principles of Universalism: that God is a sinner,—that he is the author of sin,—that sin will be saved in heaven, as well as all the animals, creeping things, fowls and fishes,—that there will be no women in heaven, for they are to return back, and form a part of that from which they first originated,—that man will form a *part of God*, as he was before his existence; and thus be

swallowed up into nonentity, by being incorporated into the essence of Deity: So that instead of universal salvation, it is the salvation of no body, but in reality, the universal annihilation of the whole human race!

31. 1 Cor. 11. 3. But I would have you know, that the head of *every man* is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God.

1. From this text Universalists infer, that Christ is the *head* of the whole human family, and consequently as all are members of his body, all therefore will be saved; for "he is the Saviour of the body." [Eph. 5. 23.] But this, like most of their other arguments, is built upon a sheer assumption. They assume that "*every man*," here means *all mankind* totally. But are not women a part of the human family? Certainly. Well they are not included in the phrase "*every man*," as used here by the apostle; for they are spoken of in contradistinction to men. "The head of *every man* is Christ; and the head of the *woman* is the *man*." Are not *women* and *men* in this text spoken of separately and distinctly? and does it not follow that *every man* comes far short, in this case, of embracing the whole race of Adam?

2. But Paul explains this in another place: "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." [Eph. 5. 23.] Thus, Christ being the head of *every man*, relates to every man in the church, and not every man in the world. The reason why Universalists commit such outrageous blunders in applying the word, is because they pay no regard to who is speaking, who he is speaking *to*, or what he is speaking *of*. Paul was writing to the church, not the world. Again we read: "Then the disciples, *every man* according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren which dwelt in Judea." [Acts 11. 29.] Did the whole human family, without exception, send relief up to the

poor brethren in Judea? If so, who were these poor brethren? Were they not a part of the whole human family?

3. But I had like to forgotten: Universalists tell us that the church of Christ is universal, and that all men are members of his body. Then, according to this, there is no distinction between the church and the world; for the *whole world* is the *church*, according to Universalism. Let us try a few passages, and see how this definition will work. "And the Lord added to the *world*, daily such as should be saved." [Acts 2. 47.] The following texts will speak for themselves:

"On this rock I will build my *world*, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." [Math. 16. 18.]

"And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the *world;* but if he neglect to hear the *world*, let him be unto thee as a heathen man, and a publican." [Math. 18. 17.]

"And the young men came in, and found her dead, and carried her forth, and buried her by her husband, and great fear came upon all the *world*, and upon as *many* as heard these things." [Acts 5. 11.]

"And when they had ordained them elders in every *world*, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they had *believed*." [Acts 14. 23.]

"Likewise greet the *world* that is in their house."—(Rom. 16. 5.)

"Therefore as the *world* is subject unto Christ, *so* let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing."—(Eph. 5. 24.)

"Let your women keep silence in the *world*,—for it is a shame for women to speak in the *world*." (1 Cor. 14. 34, 35.)

"As for Saul he made havock of the *world*, entering into every house." (Acts 8. 3.)

"Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the *world*, which was in Jerusalem." (Acts 11. 22.)

"From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the *elders of the world*." (Acts 20. 17.)

"I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the *world*, which is at Cenchrea." (Rom. 16. 1.)

"Unto the angel of the *world* of Ephesus write."—(Rev. 2. 1.)

"Feed the *world* of God, which he has purchased."—[Acts 20. 28.]

"For I am the least of all the apostles, and am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the *world* of God." [1 Cor. 15. 9.]

"For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the *world* of God." [Tim. 3. 5.]

"Then had the *worlds* rest,—and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were *multiplied*." [Acts 9. 31.]

"As the Lord has called every one, so let him walk, and so ordain I in all *worlds*." [1 Cor. 7. 17.]

"I robbed other *worlds*, taking wages of them to do you service." [2 Cor. 11. 8.]

"John to the seven *worlds* which are in Asia." [Rev. 1. 4.]

Thus we discover that the *church* and the *world*, does not quite mean the same thing.

4. Universalists are frequently heard to say, that there is not a member of their church in any penitentiary in the United States. Those preachers and editors, who reiterate this statement, appear to be very well acquainted with the penitentiaries, to be so very exact in knowing the character of every convict. Not disputing their honesty, we shall however prove to the conviction of every intelligent reader, that every cut-throat in the penitentiary, and every scoundrel out of it that ought to be there, are all members of the Universalist church. They contend for the very thing they deny, and here, as in other cases, we have *Universalism against itself*. They will not give up, but that their church is the church of Christ, and contend at the same time, that the church of Christ is universal,—that all mankind are members of his body. From this it follows incontrovertibly, that all the ungodly *and profane*, that all liars, thieves, drunk-

ards, manstealers, murderers, and those that are abominable, disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate, are members of their church, and consistent, candid, practical Universalists. They go in for the doctrine, soul, body and spirit; and show their faith by their works. This may be considered hard; but it is nevertheless true. It is an old maxim, and a true one, that actions speak louder than words. This being so, let me ask: Who is the most consistent Universalist, and who evinces most faith in his doctrine; he who walks uprightly, and leads a pious and christian life, or he who acts just as though he believed he would be saved let him do what he would? Every sincere person, me thinks, must come to the conclusion, that the man who would lie, steal, swear, get drunk, and disobey God in every thing, acts just as though he believed in Universalism; that is, just as though he believed that his wicked actions, could not in the least endanger his eternal welfare. Such a man we call a consistent, practical Universalist. He lives up to one command, and that's all. He shows his faith by his works! But the man who would preach up that the wicked would be saved, just as certain as fate, and yet would not live a wicked life, I set him down as a hypocritical professor: that he does not believe the doctrine he preaches, or he would show his faith by his works. Suppose reader, we were confirmed in the belief, that the wicked would be just as sure of heaven as the righteous; how could we make you believe that we were sincere, in professing to believe this doctrine? Could we make you believe we were sincere, by being very cautious never to commit a sin? No; this would produce directly the opposite result. We could only make you believe, that we believed what we professed, by showing our faith by our works,—by trying the experiment of living a wicked life; and thus confirming our words, (by our actions,) that the wicked were infallibly certain of eternal life. Sam Patch, we are informed, professed to believe that he could leap over a certain *precipice*, and not be injured. The people doubted his

sincerity, and accordingly, to show that he sincerely believed what he said, he made the leap, and landed in eternity. It proved however that he was honest. The great distinguishing characteristic of Universalism, or that trait which distinguishes it from all other doctrines is, that all the *ungodly* will be saved. This they may deny, and say that the grand peculiarity of their system is, that *all men* will be saved. This however is not correct, for we agree in part with this; i e. we believe that the righteous or obedient part of *all men* will be saved. Hence, the difference is not with respect to the salvation of the godly, for all parties agree upon this: it is only with regard to the salvation of the *ungodly* that we disagree. It follows therefore, that the grand feature of Universalism, which marks out the line of discrimination between Universalists and us, in point of doctrine, is this: They believe that all the abominable characters that disgrace the earth, will be saved, and we deny it. This is the exact point of difference between us; and hence we must contend, that, in order to make people believe they are sincere, who profess to believe this doctrine; they must act out Sam Patch, and give us an experiment: and then we will believe they are honest. If we professed to believe that the wicked would be eternally damned, and at the same time be wicked ourselves, you would accuse us of hypocrisy and that justly too. Now take the thing home, *vice versa*, and you will know what it takes to make a consistent, practical Universalist!

4. But stop here, it strikes me all at once, that there is a difficulty about this Universal church. Since there is no body to bring into it, how happens it that Universalists so frequently tell us of great numbers joining their church? Who were these great numbers? and where did they get them? They could not have been great numbers of the human species; for they tell us that the whole human family are already members of their church. But here again: how can they turn a man out? If the church is universal, so that there is no body to bring into it; how they can get a man out, when there

is no place to get him out at, and no place for him to stay after he is out, is a mystery beyond the comprehension of my feeble powers. Ah! says a Universalist, I can explain the mystery: The church being the whole world, no man therefore can leave the church, only as he dies and leaves the world; and if you should get in a hurry to turn a man out, and cannot wait for him to leave constitutionally; just kill him! Well sir, your explanation is the best, doubtless, that can be given: yet it only leaves Universalism in a worse predicament than ever. As Christ is "the Saviour of the *body*," and as Universalists admit, the Saviour only of the members of his church, it follows hence, that all who have been killed, and all who have died a natural death, are eternally lost; for they are turned out of the church, and Christ is no longer their Saviour. And as *all flesh* so far, have died except two, this thing of Universalism comes much nearer a Universal damnation than any thing else!—Here too *Universalism is against itself;* and according to their own creed, they are compelled to admit, that all the ruffians in creation, whether in the penitentiary or out of it, are brethren in full fellowship and members in regular standing in their church, at least as long as they live!! If they deny this, which they cannot do consistently; I would suggest the propriety of their commencing fellowship as soon as possible, in order to get used to it against they are obliged to carry it on in another world. Or do they suppose that God will have a penitentiary for them in heaven, in order to keep them away from the righteous! Or do they fondly anticipate, that the members of their church, who are now so unruly, and incorrigible, that they have to be kept shut up in dungeons to protect society, will experience a change in the resurrection, the fires of purgatory, or some other *post mortem* department, and come out christians, scorched holy as the angels, and as pure as the spirits of just men made perfect? Or do they expect that their ungodly brethren, whom all the mercies and chastisements of the *Lord can not reform*,—who died in their sins, and thus

go into eternity with all the hateful and corroding passions rankling in their bosoms,—their hands burning with indignant hatred against their fellow mortals, and their spirits thirsting for vengeance and blood, will be reformed in eternity by that which fails to effect it in time? Or do they suppose that the members of their motley fraternity, will lose their personal identity,—fall asleep liars, thieves and drunkards—and in the morning of the resurrection wake up sober, and honest men, and not know themselves? We leave it just here, for Universalists to make the very best of it they can: for the Lord knows it is bad enough!

32. 1 Cor. 15. 22. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

1. This text is relied upon by Universalists with the greatest assurance, as positive proof in favor of their doctrine. It has been reiterated in books and periodicals, enough to wear out a small bundle of quills: yet it never has, nor never can be made to prove Universalism; but right the reverse, as we shall show. If we were going to select any one chapter, with which to effectually kill Universalism, and bury it without the hope of a rusurrection, it would be this very 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians. As regards the correctness of our judgment, the reader can decide when he hears what we have to say upon the subject.

2. The verse at the head of this article is rendered by Dr. Macknight thus: "For as *by* Adam all die, even so *by* Christ shall all be made alive." This is proved to be its correct signification, from the verse just preceeding it. "For since *by* man came death, *by* man came also the resurrection of the dead: FOR [mark this!] as *by* Adam all die, [or go down to the grave,] even so *by* Christ, shall all be made alive," (or, be raised from the dead.) All the Universalism there is about this text, is simply

this: that there shall be a *universal* resurrection of all that have died. This however proves the salvation of none, much less all. It simply states the fact: that those who have died *by* Adam, shall be made alive *by* Christ: and what is to be done with them after they are thus made alive, the context and other portions of the bible must decide.

3. This text is of itself a perfect refutation of Universalism. "As by Adam all die, EVEN SO by Christ, shall all be made alive." Just as they go down to the grave by Adam, "*even so*,"—with the same moral character, shall they be made alive by Christ. If they die in their sins, unsanctified and unholy, "*even so*" shall they be made alive. If they die unjust, "*even so*" they shall be made alive; for "there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the *unjust*," [Acts 24. 15,] and then will be brought to pass the saying that is written: "He that is *unjust*, let him be *unjust* still." [Rev. 22. 11.] If they "die in the Lord," justified, pure, and holy; "*even so*" they shall be made alive. You may set this down, *Universalism against itself*, No. 1.

4. This view of the subject is proved to be correct, from the following verse: "As *by* Adam all die, *even so by* Christ shall all be made alive; *but*, [mark this "*but*,"] every man in his own *order*, Christ the first fruits, afterwards *they that are Christ's* at his *coming*." Here then we find there is to be two *orders* in the resurrection; one *order* for those that are *Christ's*, and the other, for those that are not his. This harmonizes with the "resurrection of the *just*, and of the *unjust*" precisely:—*two orders!* And with the language of the Saviour: "They that have done good, [shall come forth,] to the resurrection of *life*, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of *damnation*:"—*two orders!* (John 5. 29.) And with the prophesy of Daniel: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to *everlasting life*, and some to *shame and everlasting contempt*:" *two orders!* (Dan. 12. 2.) And also with Paul to the Thessalonians: "The *dead in Christ* shall rise *first*:" this implies a *second* and

here again we have the *two orders!* This counts *Universalism against itself*, No. 2.

5. Universalists explain these different *orders* thus: "There is one *glory* of the sun, and another *glory* of the moon, and another *glory* of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in *glory:* so also is the resurrection of the dead." (Verses 41, 42.) They contend that they will all have *glory* like the stars; but some, not so much as others. Suppose we should admit all this: Universalism would lose much, and gain nothing; for Jude tells us of some "*stars* to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." (Jude 13.) But it may be asked, how can this agree with Paul, that every *star* possesses *glory?* Perfectly. Paul tells of some men, who were "the enemies of the cross of Christ,"—"whose *glory* is in their *shame*,"—and "whose end is *destruction*." (Phil. 3. 18, 19.) Mark this down *Universalism against itself*, No. 3.

6. Some Universalists contend that this resurrection signifies a moral change, or the conversion of the soul; and as all are to be made alive by Christ, or raised from the dead; therefore all will be converted to Christ! If Paul is speaking of the resurrection of the soul to a state of holiness in this chapter, then it will make good sense if we read it in this way: "But some man will say: how are the *dead* [*souls*] raised up, and with what body do the *dead* [*souls*] come." So also is the resurrection of the *dead* [soul;] it is sown in *corruption*, it is raised in *incorruption*, it is sown a natural *body*, (!) it is raised a spiritual body." "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead [souls] shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; for this CORRUPTIBLE [soul] must put on INCORRUPTION; and this MORTAL [soul] must put on IMMORTALITY: so when this CORRUPTIBLE [soul] shall have put on INCORRUPTION, and this MORTAL [soul] shall have put on IMMORTALITY, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written: "Death is swallowed up in victory."—[Verses 35, 42, 44, 52, 53, 54.] Can Universalists go this? Perhaps they can; for a majority of them believe that the soul dies. Well one step farther; Paul declares

Christ to be "the *first fruits*" of this resurrection: and if this resurrection, mean conversion, then Christ is the first *convert to christianity!!!* Set this down: *Universalism against itself*, No. 4.

7. It is known to all, that Universalists generally deny the resurrection of the body: and the reason they assign, is: that the body dies, and is consequently CORRUPTIBLE and MATERIAL; and it decomposes, and is incorporated in other bodies; and hence they *infer* the impossibility of its resurrection. Still they believe in the resurrection of the *dead;* and as they do not believe in the resurrection of the *dead body*, it follows that they believe in the resurrection of the *dead soul*, which proves that the soul dies. And since the soul *dies* as well as the body, it must also be CORRUPTIBLE and MATERIAL, and consequently will decompose and be incorporated, (if not in other bodies) in other souls; and hence its resurrection is just as impossible, as that of the body.—Here we have Universalism coming out, and denying the resurrection altogether, and thus proving themselves to be that sect of Sadducees condemned by the Saviour, and those very heretics advertized by Paul 1800 years ago, who teach that all the resurrection there is (which is the resurrection of Christ,) is passed already, and thereby overthrow the faith of some! You may put this down: *Universalism against itself*, No. 5.

8. But to return. "Christ the first fruits, afterwards *they that are Christ's* at his coming." Universalists tell us that all are Christ's, and consequently all will be saved. But the phrase "*they that are Christ's*" shows plainly that some ARE NOT HIS. It so happens, that we have this precise PHRASE in another place, which proves to a demonstration that all are not Christ's. "And THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." [Gal. 5. 24.] Do those who die in their sins crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts? When Paul says "THEY WHICH ARE OF FAITH, the same are the children of Abraham," [Gal. 3. 7,] does it *not imply* that some have not faith? Yes: for Paul

does say: "All men *have not faith.*" [2 Thess. 3. 2.] But we have the most unequivocal testimony that all are not Christ's. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, *he is none of his!*" [Rom. 8. 9.] Let us now inquire who have the spirit? We shall first hear the Saviour: "If ye love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even *the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive.*" [John 14. 15–17.] Who can receive it? "And we are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Spirit whom God hath given to *them that obey him.*" [Acts 5. 32.] And Jude says: "These be they who separate themselves; sensual, *having not the Spirit.*" [Jude 19.] This then settles the point, who are Christ's, and who are not. Those who obey him, have the Spirit, and such are Christ's; whilst those who are *sensual* have not the Spirit, and are not Christ's; and consequently will have no part with Christ at his *coming*. Universalists admit that this *coming* of the Lord is yet future, and relates to the resurrection. This proves, not only that there will be a distinction at the resurrection, between those that are Christ's, and those that are not; but also that the coming of the Lord did not take place at the destruction of Jerusalem; and thus we have *Universalism against itself*, No. 6.

9. After the 23d verse, Paul speaks exclusively of the resurrection of the saints, or the dead in Christ, and not at all of those who die in their sins. This I will prove. He does not intimate that the "*all*," in verse 22, are to be raised to *incorruption, glory, honor, immortality, power* and *victory*, and possess the *spiritual body*, and the *image of the heavenly*. He does not, we say, intimate such a thing; but after he brings in the two ORDERS, he drops the ORDER of the wicked, and takes up the ORDER of those who have "fallen asleep in Christ," [verse 18,] and continues that ORDER exclusively to the close of that chapter. We risk the whole controversy upon this point; and just as certain as we sustain our position, Universalism falls to rise *no more*! Mark this and all we ask is

the reader's indulgence for a few minutes. Now let Paul tell who he is speaking of. "As WE have borne the image of the earthy, WE shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say BRETHREN." Ah! it is *brethren*, Paul is addressing; and now we can understand what he means by the pronoun "*we:*" it personates *brethren*, *christians*, or the *saints* of all ages, and of every clime. Why did not Paul express himself as he did in verse 22. "As all have borne the image of the earthy, *even so all* shall bear the image of the heavenly." Paul uses the word *we*, when the word *all* will not suit, unless he should say "*we all*," meaning all christians. The word *we* occurs in verse 19. "If in this life only WE have hope in Christ." Have all men hope in Christ? Certainly not: none but christians, and thus the apostle employs the word *we* throughout this chapter.

Then he proceeds: "Behold I show YOU a mystery: WE shall not all sleep, but WE shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and WE shall be changed." After this the song of triumph is sung: "O death where is thy sting, O grave where is thy victory?" The apostle answers: "Thanks be unto God which giveth US the *victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ*," (i. e. in *obedience to* our Lord Jesus Christ. See examination of Rom. 6. 23.) "*Therefore*," adds the apostle, (i. e. from the fact, that you are to obtain this ultimate, and triumphant victory by *obeying* Jesus Christ our Lord,) "*Therefore* my beloved brethren, *be ye steadfast, immovable*, always abounding in the *work of the Lord*, for as much as you *know* [from what I have just told you about getting the victory through obedience,] that your *labor is not in vain in the Lord*." Their LABOR, with respect to this victory would certainly have been in vain, had the wicked been just as sure of it, as the righteous! Universalists, in order to evade the force of this argument, must prove that the word *we*, necessarily, and always means the whole human *family without one* exception. This they assert most

positively with reference to Paul addressing the Corinthians. We will now admit it, for the sake of argument, and see where it lands Universalism: "For WE *must all appear* before the *judgment seat* of Christ." [2 Cor. 5. 10.] i. e. the entire posterity of Adam without ONE exception, MUST APPEAR (in the FUTURE) before the judgment seat of Christ, which cannot possibly be till after the resurrection; for, when Paul penned that sentence millions upon millions of the human race were already dead, and in eternity. Here these gentlemen must leave the track, or we have *Universalism against itself*, No. 7.

10. We shall now present a second argument in favor of the position that Paul is speaking only of the resurrection of the just; and this will be done by proving positively that the "glory," "honor," "immortality," "incorruptibility," "power," "victory," "the spiritual body," and "the image of the heavenly," to which *these* dead here spoken of are to be raised, are all conditional, and depend upon the righteous conduct of men in this life. If I sustain myself here: it will follow unavoidably, that the wicked, who die in their sins, will not enjoy these unspeakable blessings, described in the foregoing language; and consequently that they are not among the number who are to be thus RAISED. Let us try it. "To them who by PATIENT CONTINUANCE IN WELL DOING seek for GLORY, and HONOR, and IMMORTALITY, eternal life." [Rom. 2. 7.] Here goes three of the list at one sweep! GLORY, HONOR and IMMORTALITY are therefore conditional, and depend upon a patient continuance in WELL DOING. But how about INCORRUPTIBILITY? "Every man that striveth for the mastery, is temperate in all things; now they do it to OBTAIN a corruptible crown, but we an INCORRUPTIBLE." "SO RUN THAT YOU MAY OBTAIN." [1 Cor. 9. 24, 25.] Thus the *crown* of *incorruptibility* is to be obtained by *running*, and *striving lawfully*. The next in order is "*power*." Is this conditional? Paul is most satisfactory upon this point. in relating his own experience. "Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the know-

ledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ,—that I may know him, and the POWER of his resurrection." [Ph. 3. 8, 10.] The *power* of Christ's resurrection is the same *glorious power* which the saints are to experience, when they are "raised in power," and their "vile bodies are changed, and fashioned like unto Christ's *glorious* body;" which is, as Paul defines it: "the *power* of an *endless life;*" [Heb. 7. 16.] and is conditional, as declared in the text above quoted: Whilst the wicked are to be eternally banished "from the *glory* of his power." [2 Thess. 1. 9.] The "*victory*" which the subjects of *this resurrection* are to obtain, we have already examined, and have shown to be conditional, from the fact that it is to be obtained *through Jesus Christ*, which is the same as *in obedience to Jesus Christ*. We come next to the "*spiritual body*," which signifies a *body quickened* by the *Spirit*. Is this conditional? Let this same apostle decide: "But IF the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also *quicken* your *mortal bodies* by his *Spirit* that dwelleth in you." [Rom. 8. 11.] Thus the *spiritual body;* or *quickening* of our *mortal bodies* by the *Spirit*, is proved to be conditional, and depends upon men letting the *Spirit* of Christ dwell in them here; for "if any man have not the *Spirit* of *Christ* he is none of his," and you recollect the apostle says: "Christ the first fruits, afterwards *they that are Christ's* at his coming." [Verse 23.]

And in the last place we ask: does the "*image of the heavenly*" depend upon conditions to be performed in this life? This is the pivot upon which the whole matter now turns. We shall see. "If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; IF SO BE that we *suffer with him*, that we may be also GLORIFIED TOGETHER." What is this being *glorified with Christ?* Paul answers: "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord *Jesus Christ;* who shall *change our vile body*, that it may

be FASHIONED LIKE UNTO HIS GLORIOUS BODY." [Phil. 3. 21.] Thus we will be *glorified together*, or bear the *image* of the *heavenly*, IF we suffer with him. Mark that big *if:* for it proves to an absolute certainty, that those who will not suffer with *him*,—who will not take up their cross and follow him, will never be *glorified* with him; and ergo, will never bear his *image*.

This is taking Universalism upon new ground, which will keep it conjuring, inventing, new-vamping, and remodeling its crippled and shattered fabrication, the remaining part of the nineteenth century, which then, doubtless, cannot be made to stand without crutches.—Now, as Universalists admit that these eight phrases just examined, all refer to eternity,—to the resurrection state; and since we have proved, from plain scripture testimony, that they are all conditional; you may, therefore, set this down *Universalism against itself*, No. 8.

11. We now present our third argument in proof of the position, that when Paul speaks of the resurrection to a state of *immortality* and *glory*, he has reference only to the *saints*. We do this by proving, that in 1 Thess. 4th, Paul treats upon the same subject, and refers to the same time precisely, that he does in 1 Cor. 15th. This proved, and our position triumphantly defies the cavils of Universalism, and the whole phalanx of its advocates. We shall now compare these two chapters, and then leave it to the candid to judge, whether they do or do not relate to the same subject, and the same time. In 1 Cor. Paul speaks of some who had seen Christ, as having "fallen *asleep;*" [verse 6] by which he means a natural death. This all admit. In 1 Thess. he uses the word *sleep* in the same sense: "I would not have you to be ignorant brethren concerning them which are *asleep*, that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope." (Verse 13.) The two chapters agree exactly thus far, in the application of the word *sleep:* meaning thereby the death of the body in both cases. Again. In 1 Cor. he speaks of some being "*asleep in Christ;*" (verse 18.) meaning also the death of the body, as Universalists ad-

mit. In 1 Thess. he makes use of the same phrase, with the same signification. "*For* if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also which *sleep in Jesus*, will God bring with him." (Verse 14.) Mark the word "*for*," at the commencement of this verse. It brings in the *reason* why they should not sorrow (as he had just told them) "concerning them which are *asleep*," (i. e. dead) because they "which *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him." This therefore has the same meaning,—the death of the body;—here again the two chapters agree. In 1 Cor. he speaks of the coming of the Lord at the time of this resurrection; (verse 23.) and in 1 Thess. he speaks of the same thing: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, and the voice of the archangel." (Verse 16.) In 1 Cor. he speaks of the "sound of the *trump*," (verse 52,) at the time of the resurrection. In 1 Thess. he speaks of the same thing,—"the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump of God*." (Verse 16.) In 1 Cor. he speaks of some who shall be alive at the time the Lord shall come to raise the dead,—"Behold I show you a mystery: *we shall not all sleep*." (Verse 51.) And in 1 Thess. he speaks of the same thing: "This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that *we which are alive*, and *remain* unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them that are *asleep*." (Verse 15.) In 1 Cor. he speaks of a certain class being raised to a state of *glory*, *honor* and *immortality*, when the Lord shall come. He expresses it thus: "Christ the first fruits, afterwards *they that are Christ's at his coming*." (Verse 23.) This tells who are to have part in this GLORIOUS resurrection when the Lord comes. It is "THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S." Every unprejudiced mind must admit, we think, that the phrase "THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S" has the same meaning as "THEY WHICH ARE FALLEN ASLEEP IN CHRIST;" which the apostle makes use of just before. But as 1 Thess. has so far exactly agreed in every point with 1 Cor. proving indisputably that they both relate to the same event, and are both to be *understood literally*; we shall therefore let 1 Thess. ex-

plain who the apostle has reference to, when he says: "THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S," who are to be raised when the Lord comes, at the sound of the "LAST TRUMP." The cause of Universalism now hangs upon this single point: Does "THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S," who are to be raised when the Lord comes, mean all mankind? "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the TRUMP OF GOD, and the ☞ DEAD IN CHRIST SHALL RISE FIRST." (Verse 16.) "THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S AT HIS COMING." How exactly they coincide! "THEY THAT ARE CHRIST'S," is hereby proved positively to mean those "THAT SLEEP IN JESUS," and not those who sleep in their sins; and just so certain, those spoken of in 1 Cor. 15, who are to be raised to GLORY, and possess a SPIRITUAL BODY, and the IMAGE OF CHRIST, are saints and not sinners. From all this, we have two other texts put beyond the reach of quibble; which effectually explodes the system of Universalism, and hurls the fragments to the four winds.—"I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me write: blessed are the dead, THAT DIE IN THE LORD;" (Rev. 14. 13.) and they are not only blessed from the fact that they "rest from their labors, and their works do follow them;" [ibid.] but also, as we have seen, from the fact that "THE DEAD IN CHRIST SHALL RISE FIRST." From this, Universalists are compelled to admit "the FIRST RESURRECTION" to be literal. This they cannot avoid. With this admission before us we read: "BLESSED and HOLY is he that HATH PART IN THE FIRST RESURRECTION; on such the SECOND DEATH hath no power." [Rev. 20. 6.] We prove four things by this text, either of which refutes Universalism: 1. That those who do not have part in the first resurrection, will not be BLESSED: 2. That they will not be HOLY; so they will be neither HOLY nor HAPPY. 3. That on such the SECOND DEATH WILL HAVE POWER; and 4. That the SECOND DEATH is beyond the RESURRECTION! This counts *Universalism against itself*, No. 9.

12. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

(1 Cor. 15. 26.) This, we are told, proves that all the enemies of man shall be destroyed. But we say it proves no such thing. Yet we will admit that it does, for the sake of argument; and let Universalists prop up their cause if they can. Death is not the enemy of man, according to Universalism; for the more men die, the more get to heaven! But who are the enemies of man?

1. All wicked men are enemies to righteous men; for Christ says: "Love your enemies." Hence all the wicked will be destroyed at the resurrection, for, mark it: they are the ENEMIES OF MEN! So much Mr. Universalism, you get for that.

2. All righteous men are enemies to wicked men; (Gal. 4. 16.) therefore all the RIGHTEOUS will be destroyed at the resurrection; and hence nobody will be saved, neither good, bad, nor indifferent!

3. God is the enemy of man. Proof: "But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit, therefore he was turned to be their ENEMY." (Is. 63. 10.) When Samuel came up out of his grave, he addressed Saul: "Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine *enemy?*" (1 Sam. 28. 16.) The Lord spake unto the Jews: "But if thou shalt indeed obey his [the angel's] voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an *enemy* unto thine *enemies.*" [Ex. 23. 22.] Hence, as all the enemies of man are to be destroyed, it follows incontrovertibly, that after the resurrection, and through the countless ages of eternity, there will be NO GOD!!! Here then you have *Universalism against itself*, No. 10.

13. But these enemies that are to be destroyed are enemies of Christ. Proof: "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," [Heb. 1. 13.] is the language of God to his Son. Who are these enemies? Paul will answer. "Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the *enemies of the cross of Christ*, whose end is *destruction.*" [Phil. 3. 18, 19.] Not only wicked men are enemies, and will be destroyed; but also the *grave, death*

and the *devil*. But Universalists will tell us that the wicked will be destroyed *as* wicked, yet they themselves will be taken to heaven. Then, on the same principle, death will be destroyed *as* death: yet death *itself* will be taken to heaven! The grave will be destroyed *as* such; yet the grave itself will be taken to heaven! *Sin* and the *devil* will be destroyed *as* such; yet *sin* and the *devil* will be saved in heaven with an everlasting *salvation !!* What a *heaven* Universalists would make, if they could only have their own way for it. But ask a Universalist what he means by *death* and the *devil* being *destroyed?* and he will tell you at once: that they will no longer exist,—that they will be annihilated totally. Very good! Then as wicked men are to be destroyed, they will consequently be sent out of existence, or totally *annihilated!* Hence Universalists, on their own principles, are compelled to turn *annihilationists*, and thus renounce Universalism. You may mark this down: *Universalism against itself*, No. 11.

14. But Universalists quote: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifest, that he might destroy the works of the devil." [1 John 3. 8.] This is true: but I will prove that wicked men are the works of the devil, and therefore *they* will also be destroyed. Let us try it. "Ye are of your father the devil," says Christ; hence the devil is the spiritual father of the wicked, and they are his spiritual children. Paul says to the Corinthian brethren: "I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved *sons*, I warn you." [1 Cor. 4. 14.] Thus: these brethren were Paul's spiritual children. But what else does Paul tell them? "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are not ye *my work*, in the Lord?" (1 Cor. 9. 1.) Thus, the fact that they were Paul's spiritual *children*, proved that they were his *work;* hence the fact that the wicked are the children of the devil, proves conclusively that they are the *works* of the *devil*, and when Universalists quote scripture to prove that the *works* of the devil shall be destroyed, it is but another argument against them: and thus we have *Universalism against itself*, ONE DOZEN

TIMES in one chapter! What think you will it be, by the time it gets through the bible?

33. Eph. 1. 9–11. Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth: even in him, in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.

1. God made known the mystery of his *will*, that many things *might* be done, which are not done. We will now prove this proposition: that whatever has been said or done on the part of God, that he *might* accomplish a certain object: if that object embraced the happiness of men, it depends wholly upon the actions of men for its accomplishment. One quotation, and this position is fairly made out: "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he MIGHT redeem us from ALL INIQUITY and PURIFY unto himself a peculiar people, ZEALOUS OF GOOD WORKS." (Ti. 2. 14.) Does it not depend upon the actions of men, to be *redeemed from all iniquity* and to be a *peculiar people zealous of good works?* Yes. Why are not all men redeemed from *all iniquity?* and why are not all men *purified* unto Christ a peculiar people *zealous of good works*, since Christ gave himself that he MIGHT thus purify and redeem them? Let Universalism answer this, and it can then explain how it is, that God could make known his will, that he *might* gather all men into Christ, and yet that *gathering* not be accomplished.

2. When was this gathering into Christ to be brought *about?* The text itself settles this. "That in the DIS-

PENSATION OF THE FULLNESS OF TIMES, he might gather together," &c. The *fullness of time* was at the first coming of Christ; (Gal. 4. 4.) and that *fullness of time*, has a *dispensation;* and that dispensation is the christian dispensation,—the *dispensation of the fullness of times* in which he has made known his will, that he MIGHT gather men into Christ: and this WILL, which God has made known, teaches, that in order to come into Christ, and thus to be gathered together IN ONE, we must put him on in an act of obedience; (Gal. 3. 27.) and Paul declares, that he had labored and preached, according to this will, that he might "*present every man*, perfect *in Christ Jesus*." (Col. 1. 28.) Now since Universalists admit that this gathering men into Christ, according to the WILL which God has made known, is absolutely essential to their future and eternal salvation; and since this gathering is to be accomplished here in *time;* and since the apostles labored *according to this will*, to bring men into Christ; and since we have it positively declared in this *will*, that a man, in order to be *in Christ* must voluntarily put him on by submitting to the gospel: it follows therefore incontrovertibly, that we have *Universalism against itself* every time this text is dragged into its service.

3 Neither does the fact that God "worketh all things after the counsel of his own *will*," help the cause of Universalism. His will, as we have seen, is the New Testament. This is the will which he has "made known,' and he works all things according to it. Hence if any man is *worked* from a *sinner* to a *saint*,—from *sin* to *holiness*, or from *earth* to *heaven*, it must be according to the New Testament, or not at all; for he *works* all things according to the counsel of his own *will*. From this it follows inevitably, that God will not *work* a man into a *Christian*, and wash him from the stains of guilt, by any physical operation at the resurrection, (as we have seen in the article preceding this,) for this is not according to the New Testament plan. Neither will God *work* a man over, from a heap of moral putrefaction, by the

mysterious and *unrevealed* fires of purgatory, into the image of purity; for upon this, the New Testament is likewise silent. Hence if God take men to heaven according to his *will*, (which must be the case if they are taken there at all,) it can only be done by their obeying the precepts which that *will* has laid down; which is only another fair exhibition of *Universalism against itself.*

4. Universalists need not tell us, as they sometimes do, that because God works "*all things;*" he will therefore work *universal salvation.* This kind of logic would prove more by far, than these doctors of universal divinity would be willing to admit. We now turn it upon their own heads, and prove that because God works "*all things*" in an unlimited sense, he must therefore work a *universal* and *endless damnation!* This is even worse than *Universalism against itself;* for it is thus against itself, and against every body in the universe. But ah! says one, *universal damnation* is not included in the "all things" which God *works.* How do you know? Because, the New Testament does not teach it. Very well sir, then just give up your Universalism, and say no more about it; for we will, by the help of the Lord, convince you, if you are an honest man, that the New Testament no more favors your doctrine, than it does the rigmarole foolery of the Mormon bible. We now leave this text, and Universalists are perfectly welcome to all the assistance it affords them.

34. Phil. 2. 9–11. **Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.**

Universalists argue from this text, that the entire human race will confess Christ to the glory of God the Fa-

ney, and hence all will be saved. If their premises here were correct, I should not object to their conclusion: ut as the premises are false, the conclusion must also e, if logically deduced.

The text does not read, (as Universalists generally uote it) every knee SHALL bow, and every tongue SHALL confess: but every knee SHOULD bow, and every tongue SHOULD confess: and we know that men SHOULD do a great many things they will not do. Men SHOULD love heir wives: yet some men do not. Men SHOULD be honest, yet some men cheat and steal. Men SHOULD love and respect their neighbors, yet they sometimes murder hem. The scriptures however are satisfactory upon his point. Paul says: "We SHOULD live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world." [Tit. 2. 12.] Do ll men live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world? The following texts will speak for themselves, nd show that men SHOULD do some things which they o just as they please about, and consequently the fact hat they SHOULD do them, is no proof that they will be ertainly accomplished.

"We also SHOULD walk in newness of life." [Rom. 6. 4.]

"Henceforth we SHOULD NOT serve sin." [Ibid. 6.]

"We SHOULD serve in newness of spirit." [Rom. 7. 6.]

"They which live, SHOULD NOT henceforth live unto hemselves; but unto him which died for them, and rose gain." [2 Cor. 5. 15.]

"And they went out and preached that men SHOULD epent." [Mark 6. 12.]

"Cause me to know the way wherein I SHOULD walk." Ps. 143. 8.]

"Teach them the good way wherein they SHOULD walk." [1 Kings. 8. 36.]

We shall now present an exact parallel with this proof-text. "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men SHOULD honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." [John 5. 23.]

Christ being exalted that EVERY TONGUE SHOULD confess, is parallel with his having all judgment given to him, that *all men* SHOULD honor him, yet who would be willing to contend that all men do honor the Son even as they honor the Father. How about the Jews? Now, the reason Universalists will assign why all men do not honor the Son; we will assign why every tongue will not confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. But it may be said: God has *foreordained* that every tongue should confess, and therefore it must be done. But God has foreordained that certain things SHOULD be done, which are, or are not done, just as men feel disposed. For instance: Paul speaking of good works, says: "God *hath before ordained* that we SHOULD walk in them." [Eph. 2. 10.] Yet we frequently do not walk in these good works, as God has *ordained* we *should*. Hence, as this *bowing* and *confessing* is proved to be voluntary obedience to be performed in this life; and since Universalists admit it to be essential to admission into heaven: it follows that man's future destiny depends upon his conduct here, which is another specimen of *Universalism against itself*. What ever Christ was exalted the first time to accomplish, will be done in this life, if done at all. Proof: "Him hath God *exalted* with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give *repentance* to Israel, and the *forgiveness of sins*." [Acts 5. 31.] Did the apostles, in all their preaching, ever intimate that *repentance* and *remission of sins* belonged to the future state of existence? Nay verily. Hence as it is on account of this first *exaltation*, that every knee *should* bow, and every tongue *should* confess, it must be evident therefore that *this* likewise is confined to the present state of existence. *Here* it is, that "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." [Rom. 10. 10.] Thus says the Saviour: "Whosoever therefore shall *confess me before men*, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven." [Math. 10. 32.] Yet many will not confess him, as we read: "Nevertheless among *the chief* rulers also many believed on him, but because

of the Pharisees they did not *confess* him, lest they should be put out of the Synagogue." [John 12. 42.]

But the context is against Universalism, and therefore the text itself cannot favor it; for the text and the context must agree. Hence *Universalism is against itself*, No. 2., by quoting this text. Let us see. "Wherefore," (i. e. from the consideration that every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess, which Universalists acknowledge to be a means of our immortal salvation.) "Wherefore——*work out your salvation* with fear and trembling," [verse 12,] which is the same thing as the *bowing* and *confessing* in the preceding verse. It cannot, with any propriety, be said that this *salvation* which those Christians were to work out, refers to the present salvation from sin; for they were addressed as "saints in Christ Jesus;" [Phil. 1. 1.] and consequently they enjoyed the present salvation, and hence, the salvation which they were "to work out," must necessarily, and indisputably signify the future salvation beyond the grave.

But lastly, we have *Universalism against itself*, No. 3., by admitting, and contending that "EVERY" means the *whole* without exception. "Behold he cometh with clouds, and EVERY eye shall see him." [Rev. 1. 7.] Query: Did the whole human family see Christ come at the destruction of Jerusalem? If not, then Universalism is false. Here then we leave this text, and at the same time leave Universalism gasping for life, swinging upon the prongs of three inflexible dilemmas.

35. Phil. 3. 21. According to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

Universalists contend that the SUBDUING of all things, means the SALVATION of all things. But are they certain that SUBDUE means to SAVE? Not quite. "Thou shalt build bulwarks against the city that maketh war with thee, until it be SUBDUED." [Deu. 20. 20.] i. e. saved! "And

they slew of Moab at that time about ten thousand men, all lusty, and all men of valor, and there escaped not a man: so Moab was SUBDUED." [Jud. 3. 29.] i. e. SAVED I expect, by being killed, and sent off to heaven!

Once more: "And he smote them from Aroer, even till thou come to Minith, even twenty cities, and unto the plain of the vineyards with a very great *slaughter; thus* the children of Ammon were SUBDUED." [Jud. 11. 33.] i. e. they were SAVED with a very great *slaughter!!* Wonder if that is the way the wicked are to be SAVED, at the resurrection?

The word SUBDUE occurs thirty-one times in the bible, and in not one instance does it mean to SAVE, nearly always to DESTROY. Among the *all things* which Christ is to subdue are included SIN, DEATH, HADES and the DEVIL. Do Universalists believe that all these will be *saved?* I think hardly: and hence they have to admit that the word *subdue* does not mean to *save*, and consequently it is the old song,—*Universalism against itself.* A nation may be *subdued*, and instead of being saved, every one may be massacred. But let us ask Paul, if by Christ being *able* to *subdue* all things, he wishes us to understand that he is *able* to *save* all? The apostle answers No:—"He is *able* to *save* to the uttermost, all those that *come unto God* by him." [Heb. 7. 25.] According to this, notwithstanding he is *able* to *subdue* all, yet he is only *able* to *save* those who *come unto God.* Thus the words *subdue* and *save* cannot mean the same thing. But Universalists, in order to keep their old ship from sinking as long as possible, will appeal to 1 Cor. 15. 28. "And when all things shall be *subdued* unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him." From this it is contended that Christ is to be *subject*, or *subdued* in the same sense of the "all things." Let us admit this, and it follows irresistibly, that no man will be subdued in the resurrection, in the sense of being saved from sin; for certain it is, that if Christ be subdued at all, it will not be in this sense. Hence the "all things" which are to *be subdued* must necessarily be limited to the righteous

exclusively, i. e. providing it be understood in the same sense of the *subjection* of Christ; and here again we have *Universalism against itself.*

36. Col. 1. 20. And having made peace through the blood of his cross by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

This text does not teach, as Universalists assert, that all things WILL BE reconciled; but that Christ has made peace TO reconcile all things. Yet all things may not be reconciled; from the fact that Christ died, and made peace that many things might be done, which are not done. And thus Paul declares, that by the grace of God he had preached the unsearchable riches of Christ "TO make all men see." [Eph. 3. 9.] Yet all men will not see, for some "men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." (John 3. 19.) Suppose we should admit (which we do not) that Christ having made peace TO reconcile all things, proves that they absolutely will be reconciled; still it would be a difficult task for Universalists to prove that *all things* means the whole human family. The phrase *all things* occurs four times in the verses preceding this proof-text. "For by him were *all things* created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth—*all things* were created by him and for him; and he is before *all things*, and by him *all things* consist."—(Verses 16. 17.) "*All things*," in these instances, signifies not only all mankind, but all the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. Now as Universalists do not profess to believe that all the animals, vegetables and minerals which Christ has created will be reconciled, and taken to heaven, it follows therefore that *all things*, when spoken of in connection with reconciliation must be limited. But how much? We would say, to *all things* that can be reconciled; which would leave out the finally incorrigi-

ble *sinner*, as well as the *crocodile*. But Universalists will tell us, that Christ made peace *to reconcile all things* that need to be reconciled. Then we reply: Christ made peace, not only to reconcile *all things* that need reconciliation, but also to reconcile them *when* they need it. Men need reconciliation now; yet Universalists are compelled to admit that all men are not *now reconciled*. Hence if there be a failure in one thing, as we see there is, may there not also be a failure in the other, and all things not be reconciled, notwithstanding Christ made peace that this might be accomplished. Here Universalism is perfectly stranded.

But Universalists quote Rom. 5. 10. to prove that all who are reconciled will be saved. "Much more *being reconciled*, we *shall be saved* by his life." This however is a fatal text to Universalism. It proves that the future salvation of men, depends upon "*being reconciled*," in the present tense; and as Universalists admit that the future salvation depends upon present reconciliation; and since Paul declares: "We pray you, in Christ's stead, BE YE *reconciled* to God," [2 Cor. 5. 20,] proving it to be conditional; it follows therefore that the future salvation depends upon conditions to be performed in this life, which is another clear demonstration of *Universalism against itself*.

But in order to correctly understand this subject we remark, that God has always had a time *when*, a place *where*, and means *by which* he performs every thing.—Hence, if men are to be reconciled to God, the scriptures must point out the *time*, *place*, and *means* for its accomplishment. Let us examine, 1. The *time*. "You that were some time alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet NOW hath he *reconciled*." (Col. 1. 21.) This decides the time when men are to be reconciled. It is "*now*." 2. The *place*. "For to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace, and that he might *reconcile* both unto God *in* ONE BODY." (*Eph. 2. 16.*) The *one body* is the place: but what is to *be understood* by the *one body*? Paul answers: "And

gave him to be head over all things to the *church*, which is his *body*." [Eph. 1. 22, 23.] 3. The *means by which* this reconciliation is to be effected. "All things are of God who *hath reconciled* us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the MINISTRY *of reconciliation*,—and hath committed unto us the *word of reconciliation*." [2 Cor. 5. 18, 19.] Thus the *ministry*,—the *word*, or the *preaching* of the *gospel* is the means by which men are to be *reconciled* to God, or *saved*: for the gospel, Paul declares, "is the *power of God* unto *salvation*." [Rom. 1. 16.] In order now that Universalists make this proof-text harmonize with their doctrine, they must prove three things. 1. That the gospel will be preached in *eternity* to those who die unreconciled. 2. That the ordinances of the gospel will be administered in *eternity*, to admit them into the "*one body*;" and 3. That *eternity* is "*now*." If Universalists preach to sinners, that they will be reconciled by any other *means* than by the *ministry* of the *word*,—in any other *place* than the *one body*,—and at any other time than NOW; they will preach "another gospel," and Paul says: "Let them be *accursed*." [Gal. 1. 8.]

But lastly: *Universalism is against itself* by bringing this text to its support, when the context pointedly contradicts it. "Yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh, through death, to present you *holy*, and *unblamable*, and *unreprovable* in his sight, [unconditionally? No! no! says Paul] IF ye continue in the FAITH, GROUNDED, and SETTLED, and BE NOT MOVED AWAY FROM THE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL." [Verses 21–23.] Thus, all the argument based upon the unconditional reconciliation of men to God, vanishes before this one declaration of the apostle. It proves, not only that reconciliation is conditional; but it also proves, that men who are reconciled, in order to be presented *holy*, and *unblamable*, and *unreprovable* in the sight of God, must CONTINUE in the FAITH, or in other words, must hold out FAITHFUL TO THE END. This witness is alone sufficient to condemn Universalism; and we shall not plead its cause, for its condemnation is just.

37. 1 Tim. 2. 3, 4. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

1. Before this text can be made to favor Universalism, several things must be proved. It must, in the first place, be proved that this text refers to *eternity*, as the period when men are to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. Universalists so understand it; but let this be once made out, and we have Universalism against itself: for if men are *saved* in *eternity*, there must be something in *eternity* to be *saved from*, which Universalists deny. But to evade this, they may take the ground that there will be no sin nor misery in *eternity* to be *saved* from, but that it simply has reference to a *salvation* from the *grave*. Suppose we admit this; it comes far short of proving that all men will be made holy and happy; for they may be saved, or delivered from the grave, and afterwards condemned, as an abundance of scriptures pointedly teach. Jude, referring no doubt to this very thing, warns the brethren as follows: "I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord having *saved* the people out of the land of Egypt, afterwards *destroyed* them that believed not." (Jude 5.) Thus may they be *saved* from the *grave*, and afterwards *destroyed*. So Universalism must conjure up some new exposition of this text, or remain forever against itself.

2. Let us inquire: when is the time to come to a knowledge of the truth? If Universalists say in eternity; then we can prove that they can sin in eternity, for Paul says: "If we sin wilfully, after that we have received the *knowledge of the truth*." (Heb. 10. 26.) But what time does the Saviour point out? "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall *know the truth*, and the *truth* shall make you free;" (Jo. 8. 31, 32,) which is the same thing as to come to the knowledge

of the truth and be *saved*. Thus we perceive that NOW is the time to come to the knowledge of the truth; and Christ teaches that none can have that knowledge, only such as continue in his word; and as Universalists admit that coming to the knowledge of the truth is essential to our future happiness; it follows hence that heaven is conditional, and here again you discover Universalism against itself.

3. As we have seen that NOW is the time when God *wills* that men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved; it follows therefore that God's *will* is frustrated; for we know that all men are not now saved.—Universalists must necessarily prove that the *will* of God will certainly, and in all cases be performed, before this text will favor their theory, and then they would contradict existing facts. The context of this verse shows that God *wills* things that are not done. "I *will* therefore that men *pray every where*, lifting up *holy hands*." (Verse 8.) Do men pray everywhere lifting up holy hands? If not, then what proof is there, that his *willing* all men to be saved, is any more likely to be accomplished? (See examination of John 6. 39.)

4. But it may be said, if God desires the salvation of all men, and all are not eventually saved then he must possess an ungratified desire to all eternity! We shall set this objection aside for the present, by turning it against Universalism. God, as we have seen, *wills* and *desires* that all men should be saved in this life. Now since all men are not saved in this life, it follows that God will eternally possess an ungratified desire, even if all should be saved in the future life. For the fact that all are not saved in this life, will remain a fact eternally, and the desire which God had for their present salvation, will never be accomplished, unless they are actually saved in this present state of existence. Will Universalists say that the fact that all will be saved in the next life, will dispose of the matter; and the desire which God had for their salvation here, will cease? We can, on the same principle, argue that the fact of the

wicked being finally destroyed in the next life, will settle the matter in the mind of God; and the desire which he entertained for their salvation here, will necessarily cease!

5. But are Universalists sure that *all men*, will embrace the whole human family? Not exactly. But they will tell us it is the same *all men* for whom Paul exhorts us to pray; and consequently must mean the entire posterity of Adam. But not quite so fast. Do Universalists believe in praying for the dead? I think not. Then ALL does not here mean a mathematical whole. Do they pray for the salvation of Enoch and Elijah? If not, then *all men* in this verse cannot, themselves being judges, embrace all mankind without exception, which again gives us Universalism against itself. But the objector urges, that *all men* must at least embrace all the wicked that are now alive, as well as the righteous: and hence, as we are to pray for the salvation of all the wicked, we must believe therefore that they will be saved; for we are commanded to "ask in faith." (Jam. 1. 6.) But in reply to this, I would inform Universalists that when I pray for the salvation of the wicked, I pray conditionally, that is, I pray God to save them, IF they turn from their wickedness; and I pray in faith, firmly believing that they will be saved IF they reform. Still I do not pray for all men universally, even in this sense.—John says: "There is a sin unto death," [1 John 5. 16,] and forbids us to pray for it. There were also a class of men in the days of Jeremiah, for whom God would not allow his people to pray. "Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I will not hear thee." (Jer. 7. 16.) Universalists place great stress upon this matter of praying for the salvation of all men.—They tell us we must positively believe that they will be saved, or we cannot pray consistently. Let us see now if in this case also we cannot turn Universalism against itself. Paul testifies: "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it

may not be laid to their *charge*." (2 Tim. 4. 16.) Universalists contend that God has irrevocably decreed, that every sin a man commits must be laid to his charge, and punishment for the same, must inevitably be inflicted. Now if Paul was a Universalist, as they contend, he, as a matter of course, believed that their sin would be laid to their charge: yet he prayed God that it might not be; which was praying for a thing he absolutely *knew* would not be granted! Did Paul pray in faith? How can Universalists dispose of this difficulty? In no possible manner except by coming out honestly, and renouncing their doctrine, and admitting that Paul was not a Universalist. Paul, not being a Universalist, could pray that their sin might not be laid to their charge, upon the same principle, that he could exhort us to pray for the salvation of the wicked, i. e. upon the condition of their reformation and obedience.

6. But it is contended that the verses immediately following this text, are in favor of Universalism: "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for *all* to be testified in due time." (Verses 5, 6.) It is assumed, that because Christ gave himself a *ransom* for *all*, therefore all will be ransomed. But a ransom may be prepared, and yet men may never be ransomed, because they will not accept it. A physician may prepare medicine for a whole town, but one half of them may refuse to accept it and must consequently die. Those who, through submitting to the gospel, receive an application of Christ's blood, are ransomed, and we read: "The *ransomed* of the Lord shall return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joys upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." (Is. 35. 10.) If the bare fact of Christ giving himself as a ransom, is all that is necessary in order that men may be ransomed, why were not all *ransomed* the instant the ransom was made? The fact that they were not, proves *plainly that* Christ, having done his *part, has left the remainder* for us to do, or never enjoy *the benefit of that ransom.*

7. Universalists contend that the word "*all*" embraces the *whole human family*. This position destroys their doctrine; for Jude says: "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon *all*," (Jude 14. 15,) i. e. the whole human family: which certainly was not at the destruction of Jerusalem;—but must necessarily be at the resurrection of the dead; and thus, instead of having a universal salvation, it comes much nearer a universal damnation; for he is "to execute judgment upon ALL;" that is, the whole human family. Here again is Universalism against itself; and even so let it be!

38. 1. Tim. 4. 9, 10. This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation: for therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.

1. It is contended that God is the Saviour of all men in the sense of SALVATION FROM SIN; and that this salvation refers to eternity. This being true; then there is sin in eternity to be saved from: and as Universalists tell us that sin and misery are always inseparably connected, and as *all men* are to be saved from sin in eternity: it follows therefore that *all men* will be sinful and miserable in eternity, which Universalists positively deny; which gives us another specimen of Universalism against itself!

2. But the text speaks of God as the Saviour of all men in the present tense: "Who IS the Saviour of all men;" not who WILL BE the Saviour of all men at the resurrection. God was the Saviour of all men in the days of Paul, and has been ever since, and yet all men have not been saved. Now if God can be the Saviour of all men 1800 years, without saving them, may he not *be the* Saviour of all men forever on the same principle, *and yet some* men be eternally lost? Some understand

that God *is* the Saviour of all men in a temporal sense: but this does not, in my judgment, appear to be the natural sense of the text, for two reasons. 1. The apostles never, to my recollection, have used the word Saviour in this sense when applied to men under the christian dispensation; and 2. God is not the Saviour of *all men* in a universal sense temporally, for millions have in this sense been lost; but if "*all men*" is to be limited, as it most probably is, then there is no necessity of confining it to this life, in order to refute Universalism. God can be the Saviour of all men in a spiritual sense, and all not be saved; just as Christ can be the Saviour of the world, and yet a part of the world be eternally lost. The same way Universalism can be routed from one, they can also be made to yield the other. [See examination of John 4. 42.]

3. But do Universalists believe that God is the Saviour of *all men* in the sense of the *entire human race?* They do not, and hence this text does not prove Universalism, let them make the best of it they can. Do they believe that all the human race will be saved from sin? No, for they contend that all who die in infancy, which is a large portion of them, are perfectly pure, and uncontaminated by sin; hence if the whole human family are to be saved, it cannot mean a salvation from sin; so Universalism has to give up that point. But can it mean a salvation from the grave, and be understood in a Universal sense? No, for Universalists will not contend that Enoch and Elijah will be saved from the grave; neither will those, who are alive and remain at the time of the resurrection, (which in all probability will be millions,) be saved from the desolations of the tomb. All men universally cannot be saved from an everlasting destruction beyond the grave; for Universalists tell us there is no such a thing to be saved from, nor never will be: and as for all men being universally saved from an everlasting destruction in this life, none but the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem were ever in any danger of it, according to Universalism? Hence Universalists are

compelled to admit, that all men—universally—will not be saved in any sense.

4. But in the last place we have Universalism against itself by quoting a text to sustain itself, when the context condemns it; "For bodily exercise profiteth little, but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the *life that now is*, and of that WHICH IS TO COME." (Verse 8.) "This [mark it!] is a faithful saying, and worthy of *all acceptation*," i. e. that eternal life,—the life *which is to come* is conditional, and depends upon our practicing *godliness*. This is what the apostle declares to be the *faithful saying*, which is worthy of ALL ACCEPTATION; and not that all men will be saved unconditionally, whether they practice GODLINESS or not!

39. Titus 2. 11. For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.

1. Universalists tell us that the correct translation of this text is, that "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared." To this we shall not object. But it is one thing to bring salvation to a man, and it is another thing for him to accept it. This text does not say: "the grace of God which WILL BRING salvation to all men at the resurrection of the dead;" but in the present tense,—"*bringeth* salvation;" which proves to a demonstration, that Paul is speaking of a present salvation; which fact of itself destroys Universalism, as far as this text is concerned; for no man, however tenacious for the doctrine, will contend that all men do enjoy the salvation which the grace of God BRINGETH in the present tense. From the fact that God has brought *salvation to all men*, he therefore "commands *all men* every where to repent," [Acts 17. 30,] and *that* repentance which is "to *salvation*." [2 Cor. 7. 10.]

2. The context carries out the same idea, and conse-

quently is opposed to Universalism. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us;"—Ah! this grace *teaches* something: but what? Why, Universalism of course,—that all the ungodly and profane,—that all liars, thieves, drunkards, murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers; that all who are abominable,—who live all their lives without hope and without God in the world, and die in their sins;—that all such abominable characters are just as sure of eternal salvation, without a single act of obedience, as the humblest saint who dies in the Lord. This I admit is what the grace of God teaches; that is, providing it teach Universalism. But let us hear what Paul says it teaches. "Teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." [Verse 12.] But does our living godly in this present world, have any thing to do with the life to come. Yes, says the apostle: "GODLINESS is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and THAT WHICH IS TO COME." [1 Tim. 4. 8.] And thus we discover most clearly, that Universalism is against itself, by bringing Titus 2. 11. to its support.

40. Heb. 2. 9. But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

Universalists contend, that because Christ tasted death for every man, therefore every man will be saved from this *death* which Christ tasted. This might all be true, and yet Universalism be false. But let us inquire what death Christ tasted. He did not taste a moral death, or a death in sin; for he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." [1 Pet. 2. 22.] Hence Universalists can-

not infer from this text, that all men will be delivered from sin; and they will not contend that Christ tasted an endless death; for they tell us there is no such a death to be tasted by any one. Hence it must be the literal *death* of the *body*, which Christ tasted for every man; and if all men are saved from this death, that is, delivered from the grave, it will not prove them to be holy and happy; for, as I have before shown, the wicked will be saved or delivered from the grave, and afterwards destroyed. So Universalism gains nothing from this text.

2. But it is contended that *every man*, means the whole human family without exception. This admitted, and we have Universalism against itself; for the Saviour declares, that when he shall come in the glory of the Father, and with his angels, that "*then* he shall reward *every man* according to his works," [Math. 16. 27,] i. e. the whole human family without exception are to be rewarded according to their works when the Lord shall come; which proves that the Lord did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that he will not come till the resurrection of the dead. Again: "Who *will render* to *every man* according to his works." (Rom. 2. 6.) This agrees perfectly with the declaration of the Saviour just quoted, and thus Universalists have to admit, that at the resurrection of the dead, the whole human race will be rewarded according to their works. Let them get out of this dilemma if they can.

41. Heb. 8. 11, 12. **For all shall know me, from the least to the greatest, for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.**

"For all shall know me from the least to the greatest." All who? The answer is given in the preceding verse: "This is the covenant that I will make with the *house of Israel* after those days, saith the Lord." (Verse 10.)

If this promise is to be understood in an unconditional, or absolute sense, still it would only prove the salvation of all the Jews from the least to the greatest who were living at the time the covenant was made, and not those who had lived before, or who should live afterwards.—Proof: "To whom they all gave heed from the *least to the greatest.*" (Acts 8. 10.) Did all the Samaritans who would ever live, who were then living, or who had ever lived, give heed to Simon the sorcerer, and say he was the great power of God? No: none of the Samaritans, except those who were then living at that time. Again: God speaking of the Jews because of their disobedience, says: "They shall even be consumed by the sword, and by the famine; they shall die from the least even to the greatest." [Jer. 44. 12.] This text will speak for itself. Once more. "So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth from the *greatest* of *them even* to the *least* of *them.*" (Jonah 3. 5.) No one understands this to embrace more than the Ninevites who were then living. From this it follows, that the phrase: "All shall know me from the *least* to the *greatest,*" does not mean any more than those Jews who were alive when the covenant was made, which was in the days of the apostles; and as we have positive proof that none were forgiven under the apostles' administration, except upon the condition of submitting to the gospel, it follows hence, that there is a condition implied in this promise, as in the promise to Abraham. (See examination of Gen. 22. 18.)

42. 1 Jonn 2. 2. And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.

1. It is said, if Christ shed his blood to make a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and if the whole world is not saved, then part of Christ's blood must have been shed in vain. This however is but a fair specimen of

that sophistry of which Universalism is master. If but one man was saved through the blood of Christ, not one drop of his blood would be shed in vain; for it takes all his blood to save one man; seeing it took all his blood to make a perfect sacrifice, and a perfect atonement; and the same perfect atonement that would save one man through submission to the divine economy, will save all men if they submit in like manner. The arrangement which placed the sun in the heavens, to give light to the whole earth will illustrate this. If a hundred men should crawl into some cave, and then complain, if the sun did not bend its rays, to shine upon them in their dark retreat, that part of the sun would shine in vain; what would Universalists think of them? They would laugh at such simpletons, and tell them that it took the whole sun to shine for one man, and the same luminous substance, which was sufficient to give light to one man, would be all sufficient to enlighten the whole earth; and if a million of ignoramuses like themselves, should hide in dens and caves of the earth, no part of the sun would shine in vain as long as there was one man left to enjoy the light. So it is with the blood of Christ, "which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Math. 26. 28.) If men will accept of the propitiation thus made, they will enjoy its benefits; but if they, like the foolish men in the similitude, hide themselves in the caves and dens of moral corruption and depravity, the rays of the Sun of Righteousness will never reach them.

2. Universalism will in this case also be shown to be *against itself*. It is contended most positively that "*the whole world*" means the whole race of Adam without exception. In the next chapter the apostle declares that, "*The* WHOLE WORLD *lieth in* WICKEDNESS." [1 John 5. 19.] That is, the entire posterity of Adam, in the present tense, *lieth* in wickedness! Now, since millions of the human family were then in eternity, and at the same time *lying* in wickedness; and as sin and misery go hand in hand, it follows that, for thousands of years, all mankind who had *died were* suffering torments in the eternal world. If

this is not *Universalism against itself*, I confess I know not what is. But the phrase: "*the whole world*," and "*all the world*," does not in one single instance mean all mankind in the sense of totality. We have an example in Luke: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed." [Luke 2. 1.] Did "*all the world*" in this decree embrace the antediluvians? No. Did it include modern Universalists? No. Then *all the world* might be saved, and still Universalists and the antediluvians might be exceptions.

43. Rev. 5. 13. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever.

1. In connection with this text is generally quoted Ps. 50. 23: "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me." But let us see if all this proves Universalism. I have no doubt but that I believe this text more firmly than do Universalists. The sequel will determine. *Every creature* was heard to praise God. This proves too much for Universalism, for *every creature* will embrace all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fish of the sea and creeping things; and hence if this proves salvation in heaven to any, it proves the salvation of all the horses, cows, and sheep in the universe, for they are all creatures. Proof: "This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living *creature* that moveth upon the waters, and of every *creature* that creepeth upon the earth." [Lev. 11. 46.] And Paul speaking of different kinds of meat says: "Every *creature* of God is good." [1 Tim. 4. 4.] But Universalists will endeavor to avoid such

absurdities; and will tell us that it is *unreasonable* to suppose that *brute beasts* could praise God; and hence they are not included among the number to be saved. But Peter speaks of some men who had become "as natural *brute beasts*, made to be taken and destroyed;" [2 Pet. 2. 12.] therefore it is unreasonable that they should praise God, and hence they will be excluded from the number of the saved, upon the same principle that you would exclude a *crocodile*, or *hyena*. This is *Universalism against itself*, No. 1.

2. But will Universalists tell us that this is all to take place in eternity, beyond the resurrection, and that then there will be no beasts, fowls, fish, nor creeping things in existence; and consequently, every creature in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea, can praise God, without such creatures being included? We reply that if it refer to the state beyond the resurrection, then the wicked will also be destroyed, and will neither be in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, nor in the sea; and consequently will not be among the number that John heard praising God. This counts *Universalism against itself*, No. 2. But it may be asked; does the bible any where teach, that the brute creation can praise God? We will see. "Praise the Lord from the earth, ye *dragons*, and all deeps, fire and hail, snow and vapors, stormy wind fulfilling his word; mountains and all hills, fruitful trees and all cedars, *beasts*, and all *cattle*, *creeping things*, and *flying fowls*,—let them *praise the name of the Lord*." [Ps. 148. 7–13.] And he winds up the whole matter by saying: "Let every *thing* that hath *breath* praise the Lord." [Ps. 150. 6.] By quoting the text: "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me," which Universalists so frequently quote, they only present *Universalism against itself*, No. 3; for the remainder of the text reads: "And to him that ordereth his conversation ARIGHT, will I show the salvation of God," [Ps. 50. 23,] which most certainly condemns the doctrine which teaches, that all shall have the salvation of God, whether they order their *conversation* aright or not.

3. But if *every creature*, is to be confined to human beings, it cannot be proved to mean one in ten thousand. Paul testifies to the Colossians, that the gospel had been "preached to *every creature* under heaven, whereof I Paul am made a minister. [Col. 1. 23.] This embraced only those who lived at that age of the world; and not those myriads who had lived before, and who have lived since. Thus we can, with all safety to our cause, admit that "*every creature*," in Rev. 5. 13, applies exclusively to rational beings, and yet myriads may never praise God.

4. But *Universalism is against itself*, No. 4, by admitting that when the Revelations speak of the destiny of men, they are to be understood literally. The reader will remember this, and when we come to quote passages from this book to prove the final overthrow of the wicked, it will not do for Universalists to say, as they generally do, O that's all figurative; for this, you see, would condemn themselves.

5. Again: we have *Universalism against itself*, No. 5, by admitting that the joys of the *future life* are written in this book; for in the conclusion of it we read: "*If* any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the *things which are written in this* BOOK," (Rev. 22 19,) which shows that men may forfeit their right to the *bliss of heaven* by their conduct in this life, for (mark it!) Universalists acknowledge that this is written *in this* BOOK.

6. But lastly: we have *Universalism against itself*, No. 6, by admitting, that when John heard all these creatures praising God, there was a "*sea*," for he heard all that were in the *sea*, as well as those on the earth. Very good! But let us turn over a little further: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and *there was no more sea*." Well what else did you see, John, when there was no more *sea?* "The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers," &c., I saw "have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which

is the second death." [Verse 8.] Thus whilst there was a *sea*, John saw every creature praising God; but when there was *no more sea*, a different aspect presented itself. All the righteous were saved, and joyfully admitted into the New Jerusalem; whilst the wicked are doomed to the second death, in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone. Here then we dispose of Universalism as far as this text is concerned.

44. Rev. 21. 3, 4. And I heard a voice out of heaven saying, behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away

1. This text has more the appearance of universal salvation, than any other we have examined; and were it not for the context, we confess we should not know how to dispose of it. But with this assistance we can show, that so far from teaching Universalism, it leaves it without hope and without God in the world. The only question necessary to solve all difficulty, is this: Who are the *men* with whom God is to dwell? Who are to be his people? and from whose eyes is the Lord to wipe away all tears? We answer: those who are in the city, the New Jerusalem, or the Tabernacle of God; which John at that time saw come down from Heaven. "And God himself shall be with them and *be their God*." Whose God? Ans. "*He that overcometh* shall inherit all things, and I will be *his* God." (Verse 7.) Have none the promise of coming into this city, or temple of God, except those that overcome? "Him that *overcometh* [says Jesus]

will I make a pillar in the *temple of my God*, and he shall go no more out." (Rev. 3. 12.) "But the fearful and unbelieving,—and all liars, [those who do not *overcome*, says Christ,] shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the *second death*." [Rev. 21. 8.] But can men avoid this *second death* by *overcoming?* Yes: "He that *overcometh* shall not be hurt of the second death." (Rev. 2. 11.) From this we discover that those who are *in the city*,—who *overcome*, and thereby escape the *second death*, are the *people* with whom God is to dwell, and be their God. "And God shall wipe away all tears from THEIR eyes; and THERE [in the city] shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall THERE be any more pain."

2. Universalists in quoting and applying this text to the resurrection state, necessarily admit that then will be the time when the *city*, the *New Jerusalem*, is to come down from God out of heaven; and consequently that it cannot mean the church. And if it can be proved that *admission* into this city is conditional, and that any will be debarred from it; it follows that they will be eternally lost, being shut out from the favor of God in the immortal state of existence: and Universalism will be *against itself*, and eternally refuted by the admission.—Let us now inquire if admittance into this city depends upon obedience to God's commands. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may *enter in* through the gates INTO the CITY. [Rev. 22. 14.] "*If* any man shall *take away* from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall *take away his* PART out of the book of life, and out of the HOLY CITY." [Verse 19.] "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it,—and there shall in no wise *enter into it* any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or *maketh a lie;* but *they which are written in the* LAMB'S BOOK OF LIFE." [Rev. 21. 24, 27.] This proves that some will be outside of that glorious city, which Universalists admit to be beyond the resurrection, which is the most perfect exhibi-

tion of *Universalism against itself!* And thus is corroborated the testimony of the apostle Paul: "Here have we no continuing *city*, but we *seek* one to come." [Heb. 13. 14.] Those who will not seek it, will never enter therein.

3. This proof-text is exactly parallel with Is. 25. 8, which Universalists apply to the resurrection. (See examination of that text.) Now since John declares that the lake of fire and brimstone,—the general judgment of the dead, both small and great, and the second death all refer to the same period, Universalists are compelled to abandon both texts or admit that the "*lake of fire*,"—the *general judgment*, and the "*second death*," are all beyond the resurrection. Which horn of the dilemma they will choose, is for them, not for me to decide. One or the other is inevitable. The way the matter now stands it is *Universalism against itself*. I am aware of the fact however, that some Universalists, foreseeing this difficulty, have denied that this text (Rev. 21. 3, 4.) refers to the resurrection; and contend that it all has reference to the commencement of the church. Singular indeed! "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain," at the commencement of the church! Has God yet wiped away all our tears?—abolished all our sorrow, sighing, pain and death? Tell us ye, who believe such a consistent doctrine! Do you say it is all figurative? Then what makes you believe Is. 25. 8. to be literal; when they both refer to the same events precisely, only Rev. 21. 4. is far the most pointed and explicit? Why is it, sir, that you can believe any passage in the bible to be literal which appears to favor your doctrine; but all the rest is a bundle of figures, for no other reason than this: you know your darling speculations must fall before it, like Dagon before the ark of God, if it should be understood literally. Do you tell us, as your last resort, that it must refer to the commencement of the church, and cannot refer to the future, from the fact that John *speaks of it* in the past tense? "I, John, *saw* the holy city,

New Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven." But alas for your cause; Did not John say in your grand proof-text [Rev. 5. 13.] that he *heard*, in the past tense, every creature in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea praising God? And do you not refer this to the resurrection? Be honest now, and give it up, and leave that leaky old ship to sink without you,—with UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF inscribed in letters of living fire upon her prow.

4. I have now got through; and have examined all the passages upon which Universalists rely, in the old and new testaments. I have followed this human divinity, in its zigzag route from Genesis to Revelations, and have arrayed UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF EIGHTY-FIVE TIMES. I have been thus particular in noticing every text, and meeting every objection, that there should not be left one stone unturned in the temple of Universalism; and that the wicked (who have hitherto tried to smother their fears, by the feigned belief that this doctrine is true,) should have no cloak for their sins. And now courteous reader, permit me to ask, what is your honest and candid opinion of Universalism? As you will admit that one plain insurmountable text of scripture against this doctrine is sufficient to condemn it, how much more should it be discarded as a monstrous, and dangerous heresy, when the entire current of God's word is diametrically opposed to it? And not only so, but when every text, which is summoned as a witness to testify in its favor, is made to turn state's evidence, and condemn it to death! Have you read thus far from the beginning, and are you now a believer in Universalism? If so, you must possess a supernatural genius, and powers of intellect which have never as yet fallen to the lot of mortals: that is, to believe not only in the absence of all testimony; but in direct opposition to the strongest evidence in the world. Such a man could not only disbelieve all truth; but could at the same time be a firm believer in all unbelief!

"HOW READEST THOU?"—Luke 10. 26.

'Tis one thing now to read the Bible through,
And another thing to read to learn and do:
'Tis one thing now to read it with delight,
And quite another thing to read it right.
Some read it with design to learn to read,
But to the subject pay but little heed;
Some read it as their duty once a week,
But no instruction from the Bible seek:
Whilst others read it with but little care,
With no regard to how they read, nor where!
Some read it as a history, to know
How people lived three thousand years ago.
Some read to bring themselves into repute,
By showing others how they can dispute:
Whilst others read because their neighbors do,
To see how long 'twill take to read it through.
Some read it for the wonders that are there,
How David killed a lion and a bear;
Whilst others read, or rather in it look,
Because, perhaps, they have no other book.
Some read the blessed Book they don't know why,
It somehow happens in the way to lie;
Whilst others read it with uncommon care,
But all to find some contradictions there!
Some read as tho' it did not speak to them,
But to the people at Jerusalem;
One reads it as a Book of mysteries,
And won't believe the very thing he sees:
One reads with father's specks upon his head,
And sees the thing just as his father said.
Another reads through Campbell or through Scott,
And thinks it means exactly what they thought.
Whilst others read the Book through H. Ballou,
And if it cross his track, it can't be true!
Some read to prove a preadopted creed—
Thus understand but little what they read;
For every passage in the Book they bend,
To make it suit that all important end!
Some people read, as I have often thought,
To teach the Book, instead of being taught,
And some there are who read it out of spite,—
I fear there are but few who read it right.
So many people in these latter days,
Have read the Bible in so many ways,
That few can tell which system is the best,
For every party contradicts the rest!!

CHAPTER II.

COMING OF THE LORD.

"UNTO THEM THAT LOOK FOR HIM, SHALL HE APPEAR THE SECOND TIME WITHOUT SIN UNTO SALVATION."—Heb. 9. 28.

The coming of Christ is fraught with incalculable interest to the christian; yet, strange as it may appear to the reader, Universalism teaches that this important event took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, nearly 1800 years ago. This position is taken by the advocates of this doctrine in order to avoid, if possible, a future general judgment, which every where stands closely connected with the second coming of Christ. If they could succeed in making the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, the date of this second advent, they could then, without any fears of successful controversy, contend that the scattering of the Jewish nation, and the demolition of their metropolis and temple, was the scene of the general judgment so frequently referred to by Christ and his apostles. But if they fail in this particular, there is not an honest Universalist on earth, but what will acknowledge that the "*judgment day*," connected with the coming of Christ, is yet future. Let this be borne in mind. Universalists know full well, that this conclusion must follow inevitably, and hence they have laid claim to several portions of scripture, which combined with their powers of perversion and

mystification, have given a pretext of plausibility to their assumption.

Before presenting our positive proof upon this subject, we shall enter into an examination of the witnesses, upon which Universalists rely to prove that Christ came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem. The 24th chapter of Matthew, with its parallels in Mark and Luke, form the grand fortress of Universalism upon this subject. In this chapter they have literally pitched their tent; whilst all other passages are nothing more than outposts, compared with this. Some have even given up this chapter, and surrendered it to the service of Universalism; but we shall show the reader, before we close this article, that so far from favoring Universalism, it is the most perfect refutation of this doctrine that could be formed by the combination of language.

The Saviour in the first part of this chapter, after having described the wonderful catastrophe, that was to come upon Jerusalem, and the unparalled tribulation of the Jews as a nation, stops short at verse 22, and adds, as if on purpose to refute Universalism: "*Then* (i. e. at the destruction of Jerusalem,) if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, *believe it not*." As much as to say: if any man shall teach you the foolish theory of Universalism,—that Christ came at the destruction of Jerusalem, "*believe it not!*" Yet some will believe it, or they profess to believe it, notwithstanding Christ has thus pointedly forbidden it. In the next verse he proceeds to advertise false christs, who should come at that time, and if possible deceive the very elect; and compares them to eagles, coming together to devour a carcass. As false christs were the only ones that made their appearance at that time, it follows hence, that Universalism holds to no christ but a false one! In verse 27, he throws in a sort of parenthesis, to show the difference between the coming of the Son of man, and these false christs: "For as the lightning cometh out of *the East*, and shineth even unto the West; *so* shall the

coming of the Son of man be." Universalists contend that Christ came in this manner in the person of Titus, the Roman General. But Titus was six months or more, coming to destroy Jerusalem. Does it take the lightning six months to shine from the East to the West?! In verse 29, he proceeds to tell the precise time when he shall make his second advent. Now, if Universalism be true, this coming will be placed at the very time Jerusalem is besieged. This we may look for as a matter of course. Well let us see. "*Immediately after the tribulation of those days*, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and *then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and *then* shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." [Verses 29, 30.] This testimony forever routs Universalism from the destruction of the Jewish metropolis by the Romans, as the era of Christ's second advent; for mark the fact, it is to be "*immediately* AFTER *the tribulation of those days*," not just before, nor at the precise time that this tribulation commenced, which would have been the case, had Christ have come in the person of Titus. Hence, Universalists are compelled to abandon the notion of the second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem, or flatly contradict Christ. But they may tell us that we are as deep in difficulty as themselves, for we teach that the coming of the Lord is yet future, and the Saviour pointedly declares that it is to be "IMMEDIATELY AFTER the tribulation of those days!" But suppose we should contradict Christ, would this be any reason why Universalists should? By no means. But we do not contradict him. We take the ground that his second advent is to be *immediately after the tribulation of those days*. But we shall now inquire, what we are to understand by "*the tribulation of those days*." In Matthew we have but the commencement of that tribulation recorded, which *was the overthrow* of Jerusalem, and the des-

truction of their temple; but we have the remainder, in the parallel chapter in Luke. "For there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people; and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away *captive into all nations*, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*." [Luke 21. 23, 24.] Thus, Luke has given us a full account of that *tribulation*, and how long it is to endure. He unlocks the mystery, and informs us that the tribulation of those days will continue as long as Jerusalem is "*trodden down of the Gentiles*," and as long as the Jews remain *scattered* amongst the nations of the earth. Every man knows, who is at all acquainted with the history of the world, that Jerusalem is now, at this time, trodden down of the Gentiles, and has always been since the day it was sacked by the Romans; and the Jews have always been since that period, and are at this time scattered among *all nations*, and consequently the *tribulation of those days* yet continues! Let it be remembered by all that read, and by Universalists especially, that just so long as the Jews remain scattered and Jerusalem continues to be trodden under foot by the Gentiles, just so long will that tribulation continue; and just as certain as the Jews are now scattered amongst all nations, and Jerusalem is now trodden down of the Gentiles, just so certain is the coming of the Lord yet future; for, mark the fact, he is not to come till the Jews return, and take possession of their old "beautiful Zion where Judah was glad," as he is not to make his second advent till their tribulation comes to an end!

But we are not alone in this view of the subject; for we have as good Universalist authority as can be produced, to prove that the punishment, or tribulation of the Jews, yet continues. G. W. Montgomery, in his sermon on the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew, makes the following statement: "If then the term everlasting reproach was applied to 70 years captivity, why may not *the phrase* everlasting punishment be applied to the Jews, *when they have endured that punishment for nearly*

1800 *years*, rather over 25 times 70 years." [Ser. page 21.] This, in connection with what has been said, is sufficient to convince the unprejudiced, that the *tribulation of those days* yet continues, and consequently that the coming of Christ is yet future.

But I have another argument against the doctrine of the second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem, as based upon this chapter. We are informed in the next verse, that when the Lord comes: "He shall send his angels, with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other;" [Math. 24. 31.] or, as recorded by Mark: "From the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven." [Mark 13. 27.] Stronger language could not be employed, than is here made use of, to express the entire number of all the elect of God, or saints of all ages, Now let me ask: were all the elect of God gathered together at the destruction of Jerusalem? A singular gathering truely! for what few of them were in the city, at the time of its besiegement, were commanded to "*flee into the mountains!*" If the Roman soldiers scattering the elect, is what is to be understood by the angels of the Lord gathering them together, then I have lost all idea of the meaning of language, and the bible is, indeed, what Universalism makes it to be, a perfect enigma! But if gathering the elect, means scattering them abroad, as Universalism teaches, how, I ask, can it be made to appear that all will be saved, even if we could find positive testimony to that effect? Universalists are bound to admit, on their own principles, that it must mean directly the opposite of what it says; and accordingly, if the bible should teach universal salvation, it would be positive proof that all would be damned! But again: if all God's elect children were gathered at the destruction of Jerusalem, then there have been none elected since; and as there is no promise of salvation to any but those who are elected, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief *of the truth; it follows*, therefore, that all who have

lived and died since that time, are eternally lost, and thus Universalism, instead of holding forth a universal salvation, comes much nearer a universal damnation, themselves being judges. But it is not likely that the angel will be commissioned to sound that great trumpet, and gather the elect, as long as there are any more that will be elected; and as there are hundreds and thousands yet being elected through the gospel of the grace of God; it follows, that the coming of the Lord, and the gathering of the elect are yet future. Paul also speaks of the coming of the Lord in the 15th of 1 Corinthians, in connection with the sound of "*the last trump*," and the "*resurrection of the dead*;" and in the 4th chap. of 1 Thess. he speaks of the *same things* precisely; and in the 2d epistle he speaks of the coming of Christ, "and our *gathering together* unto him;" [2 Thess. 2. 1.] showing plainly and incontrovertibly, that the resurrection of the dead, the coming of the Lord, the commissioning of the angels, the sounding of the great trump, and the gathering of all the elect of God, from the four winds, from the uttermost parts of the earth, to the uttermost parts of heaven, are all simultaneous events; and as certain as the resurrection is yet future, as Universalists admit, so certain are all the others.

But I am referred to verse 34, as the last resort of our opponents upon this chapter. "Verily I say unto you: this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." In order to know what is meant by this text, we must come at the true signification of the term "*generation*." The most common meaning of the word *genea*, here translated *generation*, we admit to be an age of 30 years; but we have three reasons to assign, why it is not to be so understood in this case. 1. That *generation*, according to this definition, had passed away, and ten years over, before Jerusalem was destroyed.—Now, either the word *generation* here, is to be taken out of its common acceptation, or else the destruction of Jerusalem was not included in the things to take place before that generation passed away. If the latter, then

Universalism must give up the idea of the second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem, and is accordingly refuted; but if the former be the true idea, i. e. that the word *generation* is used out of its common acceptation, then Universalists gain nothing by the text, and are compelled to admit, that it may mean more than they say it does.

2. Martin Luther and Dr. George Campbell, whose translations are now before me, have the word *genea* translated *race*, referring to the Jewish nation, which has not yet become extinct. That *race of people* yet remain a separate and distinct nation, though scattered amongst all the nations of the earth, and consequently have not yet *passed away*.

3. The same word, here translated *generation*, is found in Ph. 2. 15, and is rendered "*nation*," in the common version. Had it been thus translated in Math. 24. 34, which could have been done with all propriety, then we would read: "Verily I say unto you: this *nation* [the Jews as a *people*] shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled;" that is, till Jerusalem is destroyed, the Jews are scattered among all nations, the son of man comes in power and great glory, and until the angels are commissioned to gather the elect from the uttermost parts of the earth, to the uttermost parts of heaven. And as that *race*, that *generation*, or that *nation*, has not yet passed away, but retain all the peculiar characteristics of a distinct people that they ever did; it follows, that these events, predicted by the Saviour, (the last of which was his own personal appearing, and the gathering of the elect) have not yet all been fulfilled. This text then, so far from favoring the idea of the coming of the Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem, is but another confirmation of its fallacy; and exactly corresponds with the fact of his second advent, immediately after the Jewish tribulation comes to an end; and we have produced insuperable evidence, both from the bible, and a standard author among the Universalists, that the tribulation, there spoken of, yet *continues*; and that per consequence, the coming

of the Lord is yet future! Having thus entered the fenced city of Universalism, and made it to surrender its very *citadel*, we shall have but an easy task to break down its smaller fortifications, and make it either retreat from the field altogether, or throw down its arms, and desire conditions of peace!

Again: We are referred to Math. 10. 23: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you; ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Universalists tell us that the coming here spoken of, relates to the sacking of Jerusalem. But this cannot possibly be the idea; for Paul tells us, many years before Jerusalem was destroyed, that the gospel had not only been preached to all the cities of Israel, but had "been preached to *every creature under heaven;*" [Col. 1. 23,] and "their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world." [Rom. 10. 18.] Thus, the apostles had gone over the cities of Israel, long before the destruction of Jerusalem; and hence Universalism is compelled to abandon this text, for it declares that this coming is to take place *before* they shall have gone over the cities of Israel! But if Universalists would take into consideration the context of this verse, they would find that it was spoken under, and with reference to the apostles' first commission; which circumscribed their preaching, and confined it "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." [Verse 6.] This commission came to an end, when Christ "broke down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles," and "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." [Eph. 2. 14., Col. 2. 14.] Then the Jewish dispensation ceased, and Christ completed his first coming, as Universalists admit, when he arose from the dead. Thus the apostles had not gone over the cities of Israel, until the Son of man had come from the grave! But should the reader feel disposed to quibble just here, and argue that the apostles *must necessarily* have finished their first mission, before *Christ died*; and consequently that they had gone over

the cities of Israel, before Christ came from the grave, we reply: this being so, it just as effectually kills Universalism, as it proves, that the *coming*, here referred to, was accomplished before his death, for he was to come *before* they had gone over the cities of Israel! This might all be true, and the *coming*, of which the Saviour here speaks, signify his coming into Jerusalem, as predicted by the prophet Zechariah: "Behold, thy king *cometh unto thee*, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." [Math. 21. 5, Zach. 9. 9.] It is certainly a little strange, that Universalists can never draw the sword without committing suicide? But in connection with this text they quote Math. 24. 14. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and *then shall the end come.*" They prove that this refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, from the fact that Paul declares that the "gospel had been preached to every creature under heaven." [Col. 1. 23.] But mark the language of the Saviour: "THEN shall the *end* come." When? Ans. When the gospel shall be preached for a witness to all nations. And in their own proof-text, Paul declares that the gospel had been preached to all nations, many years before Jerusalem was destroyed, which proves, themselves being judges, that "the *end* [did] *come*," altogether too soon for Universalism! But what is to be understood by the "*end*" which is to *come* when the gospel shall be preached to all nations? If it be understood to signify the *end* of the Jewish dispensation, then we can prove that the *end* came just before, or at the day of pentecost; for on that occasion the gospel was preached to all nations, in a very important sense, as there were men present, from "*every* nation under heaven." [Acts 2. 5.] But if the *end* here spoken of, refers to the end of the Jewish *nation*, then the *end* has not yet *come*, for that nation yet exists, although their city was destroyed. But if the gospel being preached in *all* the *world* for a witness to *all nations*, is to be understood universally, *that is*, to mean not only the people that

were then living, but all who should afterwards live, then the "*end*" has not yet *come*, and must consequently refer to the end of the world, or the end of time. This doubtless is the true idea of the text; yet it cannot favor Universalism, as we have seen, let it mean what it may!

Again: In order to fix the second advent at the destruction of the Jewish capital, we are referred to another text: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." [Math. 16. 27, 28.] Universalists contend that this "*coming in his kingdom*," which some who were then standing by should see, before they tasted death, is the same, as his coming in the glory of his Father, to *reward every man according to his works*, spoken of in the preceding verse. But here lies the mistake. Verse 27 refers to the same coming spoken of in Math. 24. 29, 30, which we have examined, and proved to refer still to the future: but verse 28 refers to a different matter altogether, and is explained by Mark to relate to the day of pentecost; and his explanation shows beyond controversy that the phrase "*coming in his kingdom*," means no more nor less, than "*the kingdom of God come with power*." The fact that in Matthew the two verses stand connected together, does nothing in favor of Universalism; for in Mark they are separated by chapters. We shall quote them: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with his holy angels. And he said unto them, verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the *kingdom of God come with power*." (Mark 8. 38, and 9. 1.) This shows what is meant by "the *Son of man coming in his kingdom*," or as rendered by Dr. Geo. Campbell: "*until you see the Son of man enter upon his reign*."

The kingdom of God coming with power, and the Son of man entering upon his reign, were both inseparably connected, and took place on the day of pentecost, as recorded in the 2d of Acts. Luke, in recording the same matter, has given it thus: "But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." [Luke 9. 27.] It is the opinion of some, that this coming of Christ *in glory*, was fulfilled after six days, when Christ was transfigured upon the mount, in the presence of Peter, James, and John. But for some cause, either the scarcity of testimony, or the obtuseness of my intellect, I cannot see it; whilst I can produce, I think, three substantial reasons against it. 1. Christ, when he came in this manner, was to "*reward every man* according to his works." This certainly was not done upon the mount of transfiguration! 2. If the Saviour refers to his metamorphosis upon the mount, then it was no more *his* coming, than that of Moses and Elias; for they all "*appeared in glory*." [Luke 9. 31.] 3. It is not at all likely that the Saviour looked only six days ahead, when he made this prediction: "There be *some* standing here, which shall not taste of death, *till* they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom," implying, as any one can see, that many of them *should taste of death*, before that event transpired! whilst there is no evidence, and but little probability that *any* who were then standing by, tasted of death before the transfiguration. I am aware that the testimony of Peter is appealed to, as sustaining the above position: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you, the *power* and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ; but were eye witnesses of his majesty: for he received from God the Father, honor, and glory, when there came such a voice from the excellent glory; This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: and this voice, which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." [2 Pet. 1. 16–18.] But, mark the fact, Peter does not say that the exhibition which he saw in the mount, was

the "*power and coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ," which he had made known to those brethren: but he had made known to them the future advent of Christ, when he should come in *power and great glory;* and as an evidence that such would be the case, he refers them to what he had witnessed: and the fact, that Christ possessed such glorious power, on the mount of transfiguration, of which Peter was an eye witness, is a demonstration that such will be his splendid and glorious appearance when he comes the second time, without sin unto salvation. But the whole matter, we think, is more simple, and far more easily understood, if we let Mark explain Matthew; which shows that "the Son of man *coming in his kingdom,*" which was to take place in the life-time of some who were then standing by, signifies nothing more than "*the kingdom of God coming with power,*" or "the Son of man *entering upon his reign,*" which must be admitted by all, to refer to the day of pentecost! But I wonder how Universalists would dispose of the matter, should we take the same twist with this text, that they do with Luke 20. 35: "They which shall be counted *worthy* to obtain that world?"—and contend, that because Matthew is the only one of the evangelists, who makes use of the phrase: "the Son of man *coming in his kingdom,*" hence it was a matter of little importance, or Luke and Mark would not both have omitted it!! Universalists could not object to this logic, for it is a species of their own manufacturing. But we do not dispute the text, although Matthew is alone; neither do we stand in need of any such a miserable subterfuge, under which to shelter the cause we advocate; yet we do claim the right of letting God be his own interpreter, and of making two texts of scripture upon the same subject, harmonize and explain each other. Again: We could adopt the *logic* of Universalism and contend that "*taste of death,*" does not mean the death of the body, or, is not to be understood literally, but must signify a moral or spiritual death, and as some of the apostles, who were then standing by have never yet tasted that kind of death, it follows, that the

coming of the Lord is yet future! But, as we remarked before, we do not depend upon any such forced construction, or sophistical perversion, which forms the very nerve and muscle of Universalism.

But we are referred to the conversation of Christ with Peter, concerning John: "Peter seeing him said to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him: If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him he shall not die; but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" [John 21. 21–23.] This was one of the principal texts, relied on by G. W. Montgomery, to prove that the Lord came at the destruction of Jerusalem: and his effort is admitted, by Universalists, to be the best that can be made upon that subject. But this, like most of their other texts, proves the very opposite of Universalism. Let us look at it. Now mark the fact, that this conversation took place after Christ had arisen from the dead,—after he had been teaching his disciples three years and a half, and as Universalists contend, in almost every discourse, giving them to understand, that he was going to come at the destruction of Jerusalem, in about 46 years from that time. The disciples must have understood this matter perfectly, having been taught it so repeatedly; yet, notwithstanding all this, when they understood the Saviour to say that John should tarry *till he come*, they all drew the conclusion at once, that John would never die!—Why will he never die? Because he is going to tarry, or remain alive till the Lord shall come; and of course he will never die if he lives that long; for that will be at the end of time!! This then is the way all the disciples understood the matter,—that if any man should live till the Lord made his appearance, he would never die; as there would be no more going down to the grave after that period. Hence it is as clear as the sun at noon-day, that the disciples did not, any of them, understand the destruction of Jerusalem, as the time of Christ's second

advent; for they knew full well that men, who would live till that event, would be just as likely to die afterwards as before! Universalists must therefore give up *all the apostles*, and acknowledge that none of them were members of their craft; or they must search out some "sheet" after this conversation took place, and get them all converted as they did Peter; and still they might not preach any better Universalism after their conversion than Peter did! But we are informed that the apostles misunderstood the Saviour,—that he did not tell them that John should tarry till he come, or, that he should never die; "but if I *will*," (put the emphasis on the right word) "but if I WILL that he tarry till I come," or that he shall never die, "what is that to thee?" Here again Universalism is routed, and like king Saul, is made to fall upon its own sword.

But in the last place, Universalists bring forward a number of texts, which we shall now examine, and which are believed to sustain the doctrine of the second advent, at the destruction of Jerusalem. "For yet *a little while*, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." [Heb. 10. 37.] "Be ye also patient, establish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord *draweth nigh*." [Ja. 5. 8.] "Behold I *come quickly*, and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." [Rev. 22. 12.] "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophesy, and keep those things which are written therein, for the *time is at hand*." [Rev. 1. 3.] These texts, with a few others of the same import, form a very considerable argument with Universalists generally, in favor, as they suppose, of the second advent of Christ in the person of Titus. But we shall give a sort of wholesale reply, which will set Universalism aside as far as they all appear to affect the case. The main question to be settled is this: In what sense are we to understand the coming of the Lord in the above texts, as *nigh* or *at hand*? We answer thus: Whenever a man dies, time comes to *an end* with him, individually and personally, just as

much as though the earth should cease to revole, and the sun be plucked from the heavens. Suppose a thousand years shall yet elapse in the history of the world, before the Lord shall come, and I should die in twelve months from this date; there would be to me, but twelve months of time between this and the coming of the Lord: although in point of duration, there would still be 999 years. Thus to me, the coming of the Lord would be *at hand*, because only at the distance of twelve months: and thus it was with the primitive saints; they could live but a few years at most, and when they closed their eyes in death, it would be the same to them, as though the Lord had *then come;* for time would then come to an end, as far as they were concerned; and though 1800 years have since rolled away, not one moment of that time counts for them,—their age is not increasing, but remains the same, and thus the coming of the Lord was then *at hand*, was even as *near* to them 1800 years ago, as it is to us now, unless he should come before we die. This is the true, and in my judgment, the only consistent way, of looking at all those texts. It could thus be said with all propriety, to all who were then living.—"Yet a *little while*, and he that shall come, *will come, and will not tarry.*" But Universalists contend that *a little while* is here to be understood literally, and for no other reason than because it appears to favor their views.—But let us inquire how much a *little while* is, when understood literally, according to Universalism. From the time that Paul penned that statement, until the destruction of Jerusalem, the time which Universalists mark out for the coming of the Lord, was 23 years. A *little while* may also literally mean a few minutes. The landlady says, she can get dinner in a *little while:* that is, in a few minutes. A "little while," cannot in this case mean 23 years, certainly! Now if *a little while* can literally mean fifteen minutes, and at the same time literally mean 23 years, more than eight hundred thousand times as long, may it not also on the same principle mean 1800 years,—in the mind of him who sees the end

from the beginning? The truth is, Universalists have an easy way of proving their doctrine, and refuting that of their opponents. Every passage which appears to favor the theory of Universalism, must be understood *literally*, let the circumstances be as they may; but every text against them, let it ever be so pointed and emphatic, is nothing but an eastern metaphor! Paul declares that "God has appointed *a day* in the which he will judge the world." [Acts 17. 31.] A *day* literally means twenty-four hours; but Universalists, without any hesitancy, contend that it here means the *whole christian dispensation!* Now if *one day* can mean more than 1800 years, may not a *little while*, (which Universalists admit to be literally 23 years, more than 8000 times as long as a day) also mean the same thing? If Universalists are not willing to admit the true, and obvious idea of these texts, as expressed above; they can be made to admit any other idea you please, by turning their own logic against them. When Christ says, Behold I *come quickly*, how do Universalists know but that he used the word *quickly* in comparison with eternity? Even if he was not to come till 1800 years after; an eye that could scan eternity at a single glance, could look upon that length of time as a mere trifle, since Peter has declared: "That one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." [2 Pet. 3. 8.] But if the coming of the Lord being "*at hand*," proves that it took place at the destruction of Jerusalem; how will Universalists explain this?—"But the end of *all things is at hand*." [1 Pet. 4. 7.] They dare not interpret it to suit their Jerusalem *hobby;* for some things have existed, and some events have transpired since! But the end of *all things* was *at hand*, in the same sense of the coming of the Lord, as above explained. The way Universalists understand the coming of the Lord as being *at hand*, they make the apostles clash; for Paul testifies, that the man would be a deceiver who would teach, "*that* the day of Christ is at hand." [2 Thess. 2. 2.] *And adds:* "Let no man deceive you by *any means;* [no,

not even by the sophistry of Universalism,] for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." [Verse 3.] Thus, we would have a pointed contradiction between the apostles according to the interpretation of Universalists; but when we consider, that one is speaking with reference to the history of the church, when he puts the day of Christ a great ways off; and the other, as speaking to individual brethren, with direct reference to their departure from this life, when time to them would come to an end, and the coming of the Lord would thus be *at hand*, as not a moment of time would intervene to them, between that, and the resurrection, although thousands of years might elapse before that event would occur, in view of the history of the world? When we look at it in this light, the whole matter is plain enough. But, finally, upon this part of the subject we remark: that Universalism makes all those joyful promises connected with the coming of the Lord, which we have been examining, but so many records of falsehood. They were once true, but they are true no longer. No man can now console the afflicted saints with the promise, that "the coming of the Lord draws nigh," and "he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." No, for this is now false: and thus Universalism "turns the truth of God into a lie;" and as the power of the gospel, consists in the motives which it holds forth, hence Universalism paralizes the gospel, by placing all its thrilling, and soul-stirring motives in the past tense. They thus hold out another gospel, or, as Paul says, which is not another, but a *perversion* of the gospel of Christ. If this doctrine be true, well may we take up the language of the latter-day scoffers and ask: "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, [i. e. since Jerusalem was destroyed,] all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." [2. Pet. 3. 4.]

TWENTY-FIVE SCRIPTURAL REASONS, FOR BELIEVING THAT THE COMING OF THE LORD DID NOT TAKE PLACE AT THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM,—AND THAT IT IS YET FUTURE!

1. He is to come literally. Proof: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This *same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall *so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven*." [Ac. 1. 11.] "*The Lord* HIMSELF, shall descend from heaven." [1 Thess. 4. 16.]

Remarks: As certain as Jesus went to heaven *literally*, so certain will he return *literally;* for, "This *same Jesus*, [not his *effigy* or *likeness*,] shall *so come* in *like manner*:" not *figuratively*, but literally, for in *this manner* they saw him go up. "The *Lord himself* shall descend from heaven," not his *personification* in the person of Titus! "The *Lord himself*," is the same as "*the Lord literally*." The Saviour says on one occasion, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is, *I myself*," [Luke 24. 39,] that is, *literally the Lord!* "To them that look for him shall he appear the *second* time." "The *second* time," will be as literal as the first; and as Universalists do not contend, that he came literally at the destruction of Jerusalem, he therefore did not then come the *second time*, and consequently did not come at all; for we have no account in the bible of any but his *first* and *second* advents: and as no one contends, that he has appeared since that time, it follows, that the second appearing of Christ is still future.

2. He shall come with the clouds of heaven.—Proof: "Behold he cometh with *clouds*." [Rev. 1. 7.] "And they shall see the Son of man coming in the *clouds of heaven*, with power and great glory." (Math. 24. 30.)

Remarks: This certainly was not fulfilled in the per-

son of Titus;—he came from the city of Rome upon the ground; not in the *clouds of heaven!*

3. He shall come with all the holy angels. Proof: "The Son of man shall come in his glory, and *all the holy angels* with him." (Matt. 25. 31.)

Remarks: Universalists contend that the Roman soldiers along with Titus, are what is meant by the *angels* who were to accompany Christ. Yes, indeed, those *wicked, abominable, blood-thirsty* soldiers, were a very fit *representation* of the *holy angels* of God!!!

Query: If Titus and his soldiers, were a personification of Christ and his angels, what would it take to personify the devil and his angels?!!

4. He shall come with ten thousand of his saints. Proof: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying: Behold the Lord cometh with *ten thousand* of his *saints.* (Jude 14.)

Remarks: Had Titus ten thousand saints with him, when he came to destroy Jerusalem? It is truly strange, that Enoch should look forward through so many thousands of years, and look over unnoticed, the destruction and desolation of so many mighty cities and kingdoms of renown, and place the coming of the Lord with ten thousand of his saints, in the person of Titus and the Roman army!!

Query: If the Roman soldiers were the *saints* of the Lord, where would you go to find the *imps of the devil?!*

5. He shall come with the great God. Proof: "Looking for that *blessed hope*, and the glorious appearing of the *great God*, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." (Tit. 2. 13.)

Remarks: Did the *great God* come along with Titus, the Roman general, to assist him in destroying the Jews? and was that *massacre*, the "*blessed hope*" for which the disciples looked? When Paul *hoped* that there would "be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and

of the unjust." (Ac. 24. 15.) Universalists tell us that he could not have *hoped* for the resurrection of the *unjust* to punishment; yet, according to their doctrine, Paul commanded the disciples to look forward with a *blessed hope*, to the time, when the Lord Jesus should appear in the person of Titus, to murder the Jews, and cause the greatest national tribulation, that has ever been since the commencement of time! Query: If Titus enjoyed the communion and assistance of the *great God*, how much would it take, to give a man the company and fellowship of the *great devil?*

6. He shall come in flaming fire. Proof: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, *in flaming fire*." [2 Thess. 1. 7, 8.]

Remarks: At the time Jerusalem was destroyed, Rome, for idolatry and wickedness of every description, was the metropolis of the world! Yet, Titus coming from that seat of wretchedness and iniquity, was a most manifest representation of the Lord Jesus coming from heaven, the abode of purity and bliss!! But the personification is also lame in another respect. Titus did not come *in flaming fire*. All the *flaming fire* there was in that case, was the conflagration of the temple; that happened to make its appearance, just after Titus had come, and had broken down the walls of their city! Query: If *Rome* was a correct representation of *heaven*, how could any thing be fixed, that would personify *hell!*

7. The kingdom of God shall then come. Proof: "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the *kingdom of God* is nigh at hand." [Luke 21. 31.]

Remarks: There were but two kingdoms promised:—one the kingdom of grace, and the other the everlasting, or ultimate kingdom of glory. Neither of these kingdoms came at the destruction of Jerusalem. The kingdom of grace commenced, when Christ was exalted at

the right hand of God, at least 37 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and people were then admitted into it. (See Col. 1. 13.) The kingdom of glory has not yet come, and will not till the resurrection of the dead, when the saints shall be "*raised in glory.*" Hence, there was no kingdom appeared at the time Titus made his advent against the Jews, and consequently the appearing of Christ, which is to be simultaneous with the coming of this kingdom, is yet in the future!

8. His appearing will be universal. Proof: "Behold he cometh with clouds, and *every eye shall see him.*" [Rev. 1. 7.] "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered *all nations.*" [Math. 25. 32.] "For, as a snare shall it come on *all them*, that dwell on the face of the *whole earth.*" (Luke 21. 35.)

Remarks: If any language in the bible can be made to express Universality, this fully meets the case. But the appearing of the Roman army, so far from being Universal, affected only a small district of country in the land of Palestine. Did this come upon *all them* that dwell upon the face of the *whole earth?* Where were the inhabitants of all Europe, and Africa,—the major part of Asia, and the islands of the seas? The destruction of Jerusalem certainly did not come upon all them!—Did *every eye* see Christ come, during that campaign?—The word "EVERY," Universalists tell us, as we have before shown, means the whole human family without exception. "By thy words thou shalt be condemned."

9. He shall come upon the wicked unawares. Proof: "For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them,—and they shall not escape." (1 Thess. 5. 2, 3.) "For in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in

marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and *knew not*, until the flood came and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Math 24. 38, 39.) "The Lord of that servant shall come, in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of." (Math. 24. 50.)

Remarks: The day of the destruction of Jerusalem, did not come upon the wicked Jews unawares, for they were fully apprised of the intention of the Romans, and made preparation to meet the attack. That day did not come upon them as a *thief*, in an *hour* that they were not looking for it, for they knew a long time before hand, that the Roman legions would certainly appear; and when sudden destruction came upon them, they were not saying *peace and safety;* for at that time they had internal wars and insurrections, spreading devastation throughout the whole city! Neither were they at that time, marrying and giving in marriage; neither were they feasting, as they were in the days just before the flood; or as they will be when the Lord comes; for when the Romans besieged the city, starvation and wretchedness stalked abroad in its most horrid form; and was to be seen depicted in every countenance;—whilst the ladies of the highest rank, satisfied their hunger upon the flesh of their own offspring! This had but little the appearance of either a *wedding* or an *infare!!* But thousands of the Jews escaped, at the time their city was besieged: but this will not be the case with the wicked, when the Lord shall come; for the apostle says: "they shall not escape," and as the flood came upon the wicked antediluvians "and swept *them all away*, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." He shall come "with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon *all*, and to *convince all* that are ungodly among them, of *all* their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed; and of *all* the hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." [Jude 15.] Did Christ, in the person of Titus, *convince all* the ungodly Jews? No, for they fought till the very last.—

None of them were convinced by the arguments made use of on that occasion! Did he execute judgment at the destruction of Jerusalem, for *all* the *hard speeches*, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him? How about those blaspheming infidels, who *now* assert that the blood of Christ, is no better than the blood of a dog? Was judgment executed upon them at the destruction of Jerusalem?

10. He shall come with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God. Proof: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the *voice of the archangel*, and with the *trump of God*." [1 Thess. 4. 16.]

Remarks: The voice of the archangel, was not heard at the destruction of Jerusalem; and as for the *trump of God*, Paul declares *that* to be at the *resurrection of the dead:* [1 Cor. 15. 52.] this Universalists admit, and hence the coming, which is to take place in connection with these events, is yet *future!* Query: If the music of the Roman soldiers, was the *trump of God;* how think you would the trump of Satan sound?!

11. The dead shall be raised. Proof: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the *dead* in Christ *shall rise first.* [1 Thess. 4. 16.]

Remarks: Universalists tell us, that this cannot refer to the future, from the fact that some who were then alive, were to witness it; and that in the next verse, the apostle says: "*We* which are alive and remain." From this it is contended that the apostle, as well as those whom he then addressed, would actually live to witness the *coming* of Christ, here referred to. But Paul died, Universalists admit, before Jerusalem was destroyed, and hence, if Paul was included in the personal pronoun *we*, it saps the foundation of Universalism, and proves that the second advent of Christ, was all over with, sev-

eral years before Jerusalem was destroyed! We shall now turn the logic of these gentlemen against them.—In 1 Cor. 15. they admit Paul to be speaking of the literal resurrection. Very good! In verse 51, he remarks: "Behold I show you a mystery: *we* shall not all sleep." Now, according to the above argument, Paul, and those addressed by him, would not die, until the literal resurrection of the dead! And as Paul, as well as all those addressed at that time, were doubtless dead and in their graves before fifty years from that time, it follows, that the resurrection has been passed for more than seventeen centuries! And as Universalists place the salvation of all men at the resurrection;—hence all men were saved nearly 1800 years ago; and those who have since lived are not *men*, but some other race of beings! But the pronoun *we*, does not refer to those living at that particular time; but simply personates christians, and thus we understand the text: "*We* which are alive," that is, the *christians* which are alive, "and remain unto the coming of the Lord." But the resurrection here referred to, did not take place at the destruction of Jerusalem; for there is no history in existence, that records the resurrection of a single individual as having occurred on that occasion; whilst we have the best authenticated testimony in the world, that more than a million of human beings were slain! Is this the kind of *resurrection* held out by Universalism? Do they *hope* for it?!

12. THE LIVING AND THE DEAD SHALL BE JUDGED. Proof: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *judge the quick and the dead* at his *appearing* and his kingdom." [2 Tim. 4. 1.]

Remarks: Universalists will quibble upon this, (as they do upon almost every thing,) and tell us, that it is the *dead* that Christ is to judge at his appearing, and not the *living:* hence it must refer to the *morally dead*, which was the case at the destruction of Jerusalem! But we remark, that the *dead*, in such connections as this, *simply* means those that *had been dead!* We can adduce

parallel examples in abundance to sustain this position. "But some man will say: how are the *dead* raised up?" (1 Cor. 15. 35.) Were they to be raised up *dead*? that is, were they to be *dead* at the time they were raised up? or, were they to be made alive, and afterwards raised up? You would admit the latter without doubt; and thus the meaning is: "How are the dead [after being made alive] raised up?" So it is with Christ judging the *dead*, that is, those that *had been dead*, but are made alive again. What are we to understand from this phrase? "It came to pass when the devil was gone out, the *dumb spake*." (Luke 11. 14.) Does it mean, that the man was actually *dumb* at the time he *spake*? No, for this would be a contradiction in terms. But the idea is this: He that *had been dumb* spake, after having been restored to his speech! So when we read that John "saw the *dead* small and great stand before God" to be judged; it has reference to those who *had been dead* both small and great, and were made alive, and brought to stand before God.

13 THE SAINTS SHALL OBTAIN REDEMPTION. Proof: "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory; and when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your *redemption* draweth nigh." (Luke 21. 27, 28.)

Remarks: What redemption was it, for which the disciples were encouraged to look at the coming of Christ, with such joyful anticipation? Was it redemption from the persecuting Jews, at the destruction of their city? No, for if redemption from persecution was the thing for which they were looking, they were sadly disappointed, for they utterly failed to obtain it. Paul declares: "And all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, *shall suffer persecution*." (2 Tim. 3. 12.) At the destruction of Jerusalem, the disciples were delivered out of the hands of their enemies, whose power was circumscribed by the Roman jurisdiction, into the hands of

others, whose power against the professors of christianity, was as unlimited as their hatred! Did the redemption for which they were to look, consist in the forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Christ? No, for this the disciples enjoyed many years too soon for the second advent of Universalism. (See Col. 1. 14.) What then was the redemption for which the disciples hoped? Paul shall answer: "Waiting for the adoption to wit: the redemption of our body." (Rom. 8. 23.) Hence the *redemption* which christians are to obtain at the coming of their Lord, is redemption from the desolations of the tomb. Query: If the disciples enjoyed a state of *redemption* after Jerusalem was destroyed, when they were devoured by wild beasts, and massacred by thousands; what think you must have been their state of bondage?!

14. THE SAINTS SHALL ALL BE GATHERED TO CHRIST. Proof: "Now we beseech you brethren by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our *gathering together unto him.*" [2 Thess. 2. 1.] "Then [when he comes] shall he send his angels, and shall *gather together his elect*, from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth, to the uttermost part of heaven." [Mark 13. 27.]

Remarks: The saints were not gathered to Titus at the siege of Jerusalem, for the Saviour commands them to flee into the mountains, as soon as they saw the Roman army approaching! Query: If the disciples were gathered together to Titus, the Roman general, what plan would you adopt to get them scatered abroad?!

15. THE BODIES OF THE SAINTS SHALL BE CHANGED, AND BE MADE LIKE UNTO CHRIST. Proof: "For our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change our vile body*, that it may be *fashioned like unto his glorious body.*" [Phil. 3. 20, 21.] "We shall not all sleep, *but we shall all be changed*, in a moment, in the twink-

ling of an eye, at the *last trump;* for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and *we shall be changed.*" [1 Cor. 15. 51, 52.] "We know that when he shall *appear, we shall be like him;* for we shall see him as he is." [1 John 3. 2.]

Remarks: Were the vile bodies of the saints *changed* at the destruction of Jerusalem, and made like the *glorious* body of Titus? This changing cannot refer to that event, for Paul has decided, that it relates to the resurrection of the dead; and that too in the very chapter claimed by Universalists, and acknowledged to refer still to the future! Query: If the bodies of the saints were *changed* to immortality, at the destruction of Jerusalem, and were still subject to corruption and death; what must they have been before they were changed.

16. THE SAINTS SHALL APPEAR WITH CHRIST IN GLORY. Proof: "When Christ, who is our life, shall *appear*, then shall ye also *appear with him in glory.*" [Col. 3. 4.]

Remarks: Did the apostles appear with Titus in his glory? Not quite, if they fled to the mountains the way they were directed, by the Saviour. Query: If those who were engaged with, and appeared in the company of Titus, were exalted to a station of *glory;* who, since the world began, was ever degraded to a state of *infamy?*

17. THE SAINTS SHALL ADMIRE THE LORD WHEN HE APPEARS. Proof: "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be *admired in all them that believe.*" [2 Thess. 1. 10.]

Remarks: Did *all believers* admire Titus, who, according to Universalism, was a personification of Christ? Did Universalists admire him? If not, they must admit that they are not *believers!* for all believers are to hail the appearing of Christ, with joy and admiration. Query: If the believers running away and leaving Titus, with terror and dismay, was *admiring* and *glorifying* him: what

plan, think you, could they have adopted, to have treated him with *dishonor* and *contempt?!*

18. It will be a day of consolation to all believers. Proof: "But rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be *revealed*, ye may be *glad* also with *exceeding great joy*." [1. Pet. 4. 13.] "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober and hope to the end, for the *grace* that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." [1 Pet. 1. 13.] "Wherefore *comfort* one another with these words." [1 Thess. 4. 18.]

Remarks: Was it a comfort, and a consolation to the saints, to reflect, that Christ was going to come at the head of the Roman army, and drive them all from their homes, into the mountains, where they would have to wander in sheep skins and goat skins, in dens and caves of the earth, being *destitute, afflicted* and *tormented?* Is this the kind of consolation held out by Universalism, in order to make the disciples "*glad with exceeding great joy?*" Query: If the Lord came in the person of Titus to *bless* men;—wonder how he would come if he were going to *curse* them?

19. The saints shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. Proof. "Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them *in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air*, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." [1 Thess. 4. 17.]

Remarks: Did Titus go up into the clouds? and did the disciples at the destruction of Jerusalem go up also and meet him in the air, and remain there forever with him? The facts in this verse, make truly the harmony of discord, when compared with facts as they occurred, at the advent of Titus, the Lord of Universalism!

20. They shal receive a crown of righteousness and glory. Proof: "Henceforth there is laid *up for me a crown of righteousness*, which the Lord

the righteous judge shall give me *at that day*, and not to me only, but unto *all them also*, that love his *appearing*." [2 Tim. 4. 8.] "*When the chief shepherd shall appear*, ye shall receive a *crown of glory* that fadeth not away." [1 Pet. 5. 4.]

Remarks: Paul did not receive a *crown of righteousness* at the advent of Titus; for he *died* several years before that circumstance occurred; yet he is certainly to receive his crown at the day of Christ's *appearing*, which proves that it will not be, till the resurrection of the dead! But the apostle testifies, that the *crown* was not only for him, but for "*all them also that love his appearing!*" How about the apostle James, whom Herod slew with a sword; and thousands of the saints who were persecuted to death, long before the destruction of Jerusalem? Did they receive a *crown of glory* at the appearing of Titus? How about all the faithful servants of Christ who have lived since Jerusalem was destroyed? They certainly *loved his appearing:* and did all the righteous who are *now living*, receive a crown of righteousness at the devastation of the Jewish capital? Did Universalists receive a *crown* at that time? If not, they are compelled to acknowledge that they are not *righteous*, and that they do not love the appearing of Christ; or else forever abandon the ridiculous notion of the second advent of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem!

21. THE WICKED SHALL BE PUNISHED WITH AN EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION. Proof: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with an *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." [2 Thess. 1. 7–9.] "Then shall he say also to them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed into *everlasting fire*, prepared for the devil and his angels." [Math. 25. 41.] "These shall go away into *everlasting punishment*." [Ibid. 46.]

Remarks: Universalists contend, that by the banishment of the wicked from the *presence of the Lord*, is to be understood the banishment of the Jews from the *temple* in Jerusalem, the time it was besieged by the Romans! Again: the wicked being driven away "into *everlasting fire*, prepared for the *devil and his angels*," means the fire that was kindled in Jerusalem at its besiegement, prepared for the *high priest*, and his *emissaries!* Very well: when the Lord said "*come ye blessed*," he meant as a matter of course, come into the presence of the Lord; that is into the temple,—the *everlasting*, or *hell fire!* And when the wicked were commanded to depart from his presence, it signifies, that they were to be driven away from *hell*, that is, the temple or the presence of the Lord! Universalists appear to think, that because the 24th of Matthew refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, therefore every passage in the new testament which speaks of destruction or punishment, must necessarily refer to the same thing! This is truly a strange mode of reasoning, fully as illogical and unscriptural, as it would be to contend, that because Is. 2. 3. refers to the day of pentecost, therefore every prophecy in the old testament relates to the same day. Why should the apostles, in addressing churches, and brethren among the Gentiles, at more than a thousand miles distance from the land of Judea, threaten the disobedient with the destruction of Jerusalem? Such was the case, according to Universalism, with the Thessalonians. They lived eleven hundred miles from Jerusalem; and yet Paul threatened those who troubled the saints, with an everlasting destruction and banishment from the *temple*, when Titus came to besiege Jerusalem! This is about as beautiful an idea, as for a man to go, and preach to the Canadians, and warn every man night and day with tears, to prepare themselves, for in about forty years, there is to be an awful explosion of melted lava, from the crater of Mt. Vesuvius!! If I only possessed the power to make this thing appear as ridiculous as it *really is;* there is not a Universalist in existence, with

half an ounce of perception, that would not blush for shame, and abandon the doctrine forever. I know it is contended, that those who troubled the brethren at Thessalonica were the Jews, and that in all probability they would be in Jerusalem at the time it was destroyed. But this is all a mistake. It was the Gentiles, their own *countrymen*, by whom they were *troubled*. Proof: "For ye brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judea are in Christ Jesus; for *ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen*, even as they have of the *Jews*." [1 Thess. 2. 14.] But the punishment of the wicked, which is to take place at the coming of Christ, cannot possibly refer to the tribulation of the Jews, for in the next chapter, as we have seen, Paul puts that day a great ways off; but speaks of the Jews in the *present tense:* "The *wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.*" [1 Thess. 2. 16.] But since the Gentile disciples at Thessalonica, were to be gathered to Christ, at the time he appeared to destroy the wicked; it follows, that he did not come at the destruction of Jerusalem; for there is not the tenth part of one probability in ten million, that all the disciples were taken eleven hundred miles, and gathered around Titus!

22. THE EARTH AND THE WORKS THAT ARE THEREIN SHALL BE BURNED UP. Proof: "But the *day of the Lord* will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein, *shall be burned up*." (2 Pet. 3. 10.)

Remarks: Universalists inform us that this is all figurative, and has reference to the passing away of the old Jewish dispensation. But it is a little queer, how a dispensation could burn up; and how the *elements* of that dispensation could melt with fervent heat! But it is even stranger still, how the Mosaic dispensation could be disannulled and destroyed by Titus, thirty seven years after having been abrogated by the death of Christ! (See

Eph. 2. 14, 15. Col. 2. 14. Gal. 3. 19, 24. Heb. 9. 26.) You can see, that Universalists find no difficulty in making any thing a figure, which, like the above text, comes in direct contradiction to their theory. But they say, it is unreasonable and absurd, to give Peter's language a literal application, for more than two thirds of the earth is water: how can water burn? This is exceedingly unaccountable in the judment of a Universalist; yet he can swallow down the idea without any difficulty, that a dispensation could *take fire, melt with fervent heat, be dissolved and burn up!* But we are prepared to show that a literal interpretation of Peter's language is every way reasonable and consistant. Naturalists inform us, that water is composed of two gases, hydrogen and oxygen, which, when separated, will take fire as quick as powder. Why may not God, by his Almighty fiat, decompose these gases, and make them serve as kindling wood, to assist in the conflagration of the Universe? Could not every grain of dust, by the decree of Almighty power, be turned into powder, as easily as to be turned into living insects, as was the case in one of the ten plagues of Egypt? Upon the same principle, rocks and mountains, could be changed to heaps of brimstone, and all uniting into that grand, and eternal explosion, which will one day wrap this earth in one convolving sheet of flame! Here then, is nothing unreasonable, whilst every thing in connection with this subject proves it to be literal; and it follows hence, that the coming of the Lord is connection with this wonderful event is yet future!

23. THERE SHALL BE NEW HEAVENS, AND A NEW EARTH. Proof: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for *new heavens and a new earth*, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. 3. 13.)

Remarks: This too, is all a *figure*, according to Universalism. It signifies a new dispensation, and a new order of things, which was brought about at the destruction of Jerusalem. But, it is "according to his *promise*." *How* happens it, that a promise of God is all figurative in

one case, but when they come to the *promise* made to Abraham,—or some other *promise*, which they can fancy leans towards Universalism: and behold! it is as literal, as the day is long! If the "*promise*" of new heavens, and a new earth is a figure, I would like to put Universalists to the test, to prove that there is a *promise* in the bible to be understood literally. When they would undertake to show, that the promise to Abraham was literal, I could adopt their own system of logic, and prove to a demonstration that it meant directly the opposite of what it said, and thus, instead of *all nations* being *blessed*, it might signify a *curse*, or something as bad! Query: If the events spoken of in this text, relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, and since that we have enjoyed the new *heavens* and the new *earth* wherein dwells *righteousness;* what think you, must have been the *old* heavens and the *old* earth, wherein *sin* dwelt?!!

24. CHRIST SHALL DELIVER UP THE MEDIATORIAL REIGN. Proof: "Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his *coming; then* cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom* to God even the Father." (1 Cor. 15. 23, 24.)

Remarks: When Christ had completed his first coming, he took the mediatorial reign; and at his second coming, he will deliver it up to the Father. Now if Christ came the second time at the siege of Jerusalem, he *there* and *then* delivered up the mediatorship, and *all flesh* since that time, have died and gone into eternity without the least assurance of ever being saved. For where there is no *mediation*, there can be no *salvation!* Thus these latter day-scoffers, who say, "where is the promise of his coming," instead of holding out a universal salvation, comes altogether nearer a universal damnation, when it is once presented in its true garb, and *reductio ad absurdem!* Consistency is a jewel of immense value! but I fear it will never shine in the crown of a Universalist's; for error is not only *inconsistent* with itself, but with every thing in the Universe!

25. When he comes, he shall destroy death. Proof: "For *he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet:* the last enemy that shall be *destroyed is death.*" (1 Cor. 15. 25, 26.)

Remarks: This caps the climax, and crowns the cap. Christ is to reign, until he comes to make up his jewels, and to deliver up the kingdom to God the Father; but that which shall wind up the drama, and close the scene, is the utter destruction of *death.* This cannot be until all that are in the graves, shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth, and until the dead, small and great, shall stand before God. Will Universalists contend that Christ came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem? that he delivered up the mediatorial kingdom,—raised the dead,—and *destroyed death?* If not, let them just honestly yield the point,—give up Universalism,—come out like men and acknowledge the doctrine all a hoax!

"I WILL COME AGAIN."—John 14. 3.

1. Our Saviour once more upon earth shall appear,
In person as lit'ral as when he was here;
The clouds are his chariot, and glory his throne;
Whilst myriads of angels his majesty own.

2. Ten thousand bright saints with the Lord shall descend,
Their strains of hosannas the heavens shall rend:
Whilst the angels who sung the glad song of his Birth,
Shall gather his saints from the ends of the earth.

3. The kingdom shall come, and the graves shall give way,
And his saints be redeem'd from their prison of clay;
For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall come forth,
From the east, from the west, from the south, from the north.

4. All the nations of men are before him conveyed,
His bar of tribunal in justice arrayed;
Each tongue shall confess, whilst the Judge on the throne,
Shall the wicked condemn, and acknowledge his own.

5. Each eye shall behold him, in awful attire,
The saints shall be glad, and their Saviour admire;
Whilst those who condemned him to die on the tree,
Shall wail, when that glorious Messiah they see.

6. 'Twill comfort the saints to reflect on the day,
When sorrow and sighing shall vanish away:
When they shall be crown'd, and ascend to the skies,
And all tears shall forever be wiped from their eyes.

7. These bodies, though vile, shall be fashioned aright,
And robed in a costume of glory and light;
With songs of thanksgiving, we'll rise in the air,
And dwell with our Saviour eternally there.

8. The world shall be burned, and all nature dissolve,
And the earth on its axis shall cease to revolve;
Whilst the heavens roll'd up, shall depart as a scroll,
And the stars into regions of darkness shall fall.

9. Creation, convulsed to her centre, shall quake,
At his voice the foundations of heaven will shake;
The sun and the moon shall grow dim and decay,
And the earth, from his presence, shall vanish away.

10. But celestial heavens and earth shall be made,
All garnished with glory, that never shall fade;
The redeemed shall rejoice in that blissful abode,
Where sorrow shall never their pleasure corrode.

11. Unpolluted by sin, and unhurt by disease,
With their ensign of triumph, unfurl'd in the breeze;
A crown of bright glory they ever shall wear,
And palm-wreaths of honor, triumphantly bear!

12. A convoy of angels, and chariot of love,
Shall escort them safe home to that city above;
Transform'd like the Saviour, secure from all pain,
In his glorified presence, forever to reign!

13. But the wicked shall sink into darkness and gloom,
Everlasting destruction,—their sentence and doom;
From the presence of God and the Lamb they shall flee,
And the glory of heaven they never shall see!

14. The remedial kingdom shall come to an end,
And the sceptre of pardon—no longer extend;
Death spoil'd of his trophies, all vanquish'd shall fall,
The saints saved in heaven, and GOD ALL IN ALL.

CHAPTER III.

THE GENERAL JUDGMENT.

| FATHER JUDGETH NO MAN, BUT HATH COMMITTED ALL JUDGMENT UNTO THE SON."—John 5. 22.

niversalists have two theories at command, with re-
t to the day of Judgment; so that when one gives
, the other is seized as the only true ground upon
subject. At one time they will contend, that the
ruction of Jerusalem was the day of Judgment, spo-
of in the scriptures; but when driven from this posi-
, they lay claim to the whole *christian dispensation*,
contend that men are *judged*, *condemned*, and *pun-
d*, every day as they go along. Hence we know
where to take them, unless we should take them
rever we happened to find them. This, I presume,
shall have to do. But in the first place, we proceed
xamine the texts of scripture, relied upon as proof in
r of the above positions.

And Jesus said: *for judgment* am I come into this
ld." [John 9. 39.] The word *judgment*, as used in
scriptures, does not always have the same meaning.
his fact Universalists appear to be entirely ignorant.
y argue as though this text, and every other in the
, which speaks of *judgment*, has reference to the
sion of moral character, and the execution of divine
lty. The context, however, must explain all such

matters. The text above quoted has reference to another subject altogether, as the remainder of that verse will prove. "For judgment am I come into this world, that *they which see not might see*, and that they which see, might be made blind." Christ had just performed a miracle, in opening the eyes of a blind man; and he has reference only to such displays of miraculous power, in attestation of his Messiahship; and for such miraculous "*judgment*" did Christ come into the world;—to prove that he was really the Christ, the Son of God." But Universalists contradict themselves, by contending as they do, that Christ came the second time at the destruction of Jerusalem to judge the world; and then immediately quoting the language of Christ, to prove that he came the first time for that very purpose! They not only contradict themselves, but they make Christ contradict himself, by first teaching that he came to judge the world, (as Universalists interpret his language,) and then affirming, as he does, in John 12. 47: "*I came not to judge the world.*" Universalists cannot for their lives, reconcile this discrepancy, which is only a sample of the havock they are continually making with the bible.

But they quote another text: "*Now is the judgment of this world.*" [John 12. 31.] The Universalist exposition of this language, would present the same contradictions, as stated above. Hence, let it mean what it may, it cannot signify what they say it does. But Christ speaks immediately after, concerning his own death; and it is most probable he refers to the unrighteous *judgment* pronounced against him by the chief priests, which he designates as "the *judgment* of this world;" for then was fulfilled the prediction of Isaiah: "He was taken from prison, and *from judgment.*" [Is. 53. 8.] Let it still be borne in mind, that Christ has most distinctly stated, that he did not come the first time "to *judge the world;*" and hence, he did not come to *condemn* it; for it would be most unreasonable to condemn men, before they were judged. The Saviour bears witness to this, and testifies, that "God sent not his Son into the world to con-

demn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." [John 3. 17.] And since Christ did not come the first time to *judge* the world, he has therefore reserved that work for his second coming; and as we have most incontrovertibly proven, in the preceding chapter, that his second advent is yet future, and will be at *the* resurrection of the dead; it follows just as incontrovertibly, that *then*, and *there*, will be the day of judgment!

But we are referred to 1 Pet. 4. 17: "The time *is come*, that judgment must begin at the house of God." This, it is said, proves that *now* is the judgment day, and that *now*, in the christian dispensation, Christ is judging men according to their deeds. But Universalists forget their blustering, about the little word "*one*" being italicised in Is. 45. 24! They tell us that such words were supplied by the translators, and are not to be found in the original; and if such words do not make good sense, they are not correct! Very good, gentlemen: How about the word "*is come?*" If you turn to King James's translation, you will find it in *italics*, just like that troublesome little word "*one*," which has caused so much blustering. Neither will this phrase, "*is come*," make sense, or harmonize with the remainder of the text. "The time *is come*, that judgment *must begin*." Thus we have "*must begin*," in the future, and "*is come*," in the present tense! If the phrase, *will come*, had been supplied, instead of the one that is, the text would then be consistent with itself. "The time *will come* that judgment *must begin* at the house of God." Both are thus put in the future tense, which is not only consistent with itself, but as we shall show, consistent with the whole revelation of God. In connection with the above text is quoted another: "Who shall give account to him that *is ready* to judge the quick and the dead." [1 Pet. 4. 5.] This however, does not say, that Christ *is judging* the quick and the dead; although the christian dispensation had then been going on for nearly thirty years. This demonstrates, that the christian dispensation is not the "judgment day." But he

was then ready *to judge* the living and the dead—has been ready ever since, and is now ready; and he will judge them, whenever the *dead* are raised, and they, with the *living*, are brought to stand before God.

The fact that he was *ready* to judge them 1800 years ago, is no proof that they were then judged; for, according to Peter's testimony, he might be ready two thousand years, and it would be no longer than two days to us. This would not be very long! But we shall now invite the attention of the reader to our positive testimony.

TWENTY-FIVE INCONTROVERTIBLE ARGUMENTS TO PROVE THAT THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, AND THE FINAL SEPARATION OF THE RIGHTEOUS FROM THE WICKED, ARE YET FUTURE, BEYOND DEATH, AND AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD!

1. "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed *a day*, in the which he *will judge* the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." [Ac. 17. 30, 31.]

Remarks: This "*day*," in which God *will judge* the world, cannot mean the *christian dispensation*, for that was then in progress. But this judgment *day* was still future:—"*will judge*," not *is judging!* Mark this! Again: in this future *day*, "*the world*," is to be judged; and Universalists tell us that "*the world*," means the whole human family without exception. (See examination of John 1. 29., chap. 1.) "*The world*," as Universalists understand it, never was, nor never will be judged, in the christian dispensation, until the resurrection of the dead; for, more than ten thousand times ten thousand of *the world*, were dead and in their graves, before the *christian* dispensation had commenced.

But Universalists tell us, that Adam died, the very *day* he eat of the forbidden fruit; for it is not likely, when God laid down the prohibition: "In the *day* thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," that he used the word "*day*" in any other than the sense understood by Adam, that is, literally. We admit the premises,—that God made use of the word *day* as Adam understood it; but we deny the conclusion,—that Adam actually died the day he partook of the interdicted tree. (See Ezek. 33. 14.) Now let Universalists stand to their own logic, and it will be then understood, that when God speaks of *a day* in which he will judge the world, he means to be understood "*a day*," in the literal sense of that word. Very well, say you, that may all be admitted, and yet the *day* in which God was to judge *the world*, may have reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. In this, sir, you renounce Universalism, by admitting that "*the world*" signifies only a few of the Jews, and consequently, that Christ being "the Saviour of *the world*," as well as taking away the sin of *the world*, has reference only to those who died at the siege of Jerusalem! Thus Universalism is in a bad fix, let it take which ground it will. But suppose we examine this Jerusalem business, and see how it will work along side of this text. "God *commands* ALL MEN EVERY WHERE *to repent, because* he has appointed a day, in which he will" *destroy Jerusalem!!* Yes, all the Gentiles,—with those away off in the city of Athens,—they must all repent, for in about twenty years there is to be a fuss raised between the Jews and the Romans, down yonder in the land of Judea, about twelve or fifteen hundred miles off!! What a wonderful inducement this must have been!

2. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." [2 Cor. 5. 10.]

Remarks: This cannot have reference to the christian dispensation; for Paul speaks in the future tense: "We

MUST ALL APPEAR before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one MAY RECEIVE." Had he referred to the christian dispensation, he would have expressed himself thus: "We all *now stand* before the judgment seat of Christ, and are, every one, *receiving, every day of our lives, as we go along*, according to our deeds." Neither can it refer to the judgment seat of Titus; for Paul, and perhaps a large number of those whom he addressed, were dead and in eternity, before ever Titus made his advent. And if it could be proved, that they all lived till Jerusalem was destroyed, still Universalists would have to be wiser than serpents, and the old serpent along with the rest, to prove that the whole Corinthian church was taken nearly a thousand miles, to stand before Titus while he butchered the Jews! But Universalists tell us that the words "*done*," and "*his*," in this verse, are supplied by the translators; and that the text makes good sense without them. They think by this means, they will confine it to this life. Let us now read it without those supplied words. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the THINGS IN BODY, [i. e. all at once,—in a *lump*,] according to that he hath done." Is this receiving a little here, and a little there, scattered along through our whole lifetime?! Not exactly!

3. "And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and *judgment to come*, Felix trembled." (Acts 24. 25.)

Remarks: This is but another demonstration of the fallacy of Universalism, in trying to make the christian dispensation the day of judgment, or else Paul was not yet converted to the truth: for, notwithstanding the day of judgment had been going on, ever since Christ was exalted at the right hand of God, nearly thirty years, still the apostle understood the matter no better, than to preach up orthodoxy,—that the day of judgment was yet future! Ah! say you, Paul certainly had reference, this *time, to the* destruction of Jerusalem, any how. But I

think you will soon be glad to take that back. Felix was a Roman governor; and think you, Paul preaching to him about the destruction of Jerusalem would make him tremble? Is it at all likely that a Roman governor would be very much alarmed, to be informed that his own countrymen were going to obtain a signal victory over their enemies, and achieve a most wonderful conquest? Felix might be the very man, who would delight in helping to pull down the walls of Jerusalem; yet, when Paul gave him to understand that he, with his fellow citizens, were going to succeed in achieving a mighty victory, he was so frightened that he *trembled!* Can Universalism go this?

4. "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the *day of judgment.*" (Math. 12. 36.)

Remarks: From this also we discover, that the day of judgment, when Christ taught the people, was yet future. But it may be said, that this could be the case, and the day of judgment still signify the christian dispensation; as that did not commence till the day of pentecost, when Christ entered upon his reign. But was every idle word that was spoken previous to this, brought to an account since the dispensation of Christ commenced? How about the idle words uttered by Judas, at the time he betrayed his Lord? Did he give an account thereof, after the day of pentecost? Not quite, unless he did it in eternity, and Universalists, I reckon, would not allow him to do that. We shall let the Saviour explain himself fully upon the day of judgment; before we close this chapter.

5. "For if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful LOOKING FOR OF JUDGMENT, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." (Heb. 10. 27.) "But after thy hard and impenitent heart, TREASUREST UP to thyself WRATH AGAINST THE DAY OF WRATH, and revelation of the

righteous judgment of God, who WILL RENDER TO EVERY MAN according to his works." [Rom. 2. 5, 6.]

Remarks: In the first text we have it declared, that the wicked were to *look* for a *judgment* and *fiery indignation* still in the future; notwithstanding the christian dispensation had commenced upwards of thirty years before. In the second text, the apostle asserts, that the wicked were *treasuring up wrath* against some future *day*, when there should be a revelation of the *righteous judgment* of God. This will be hard to make jibe with the judgment day of Universalism, at the coming of Titus; for it would be the essence of folly to suppose, that the apostle would threaten the wicked Romans with the destruction of Jerusalem, when they were the very men who would destroy it!!

6. "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to *be reserved unto judgment*." (2 Pet. 2. 4.) "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." (Jude 6.)

Remarks: Were the rebellious angels cast down to hell, and reserved unto the destruction of Jerusalem to be punished? I know Universalists contend, that these angels were nothing more than wicked men. But Peter, in the same chapter, testifies that *angels* "are greater in power and might" than men; (verse 11,) showing conclusively, that he uses the term *angel*, not with respect to men, but a higher order of intelligences. But let this be as it may, it affects not the present argument in the least; but admitting them to be men, makes the matter only worse for Universalism; for if men, who *had sinned*, in the past tense, were then *being reserved* till some future *day*, called the judgment of the *great day*, to be punished; it behooves men now to take heed, lest they fall into the same condemnation. Query: Were those *human angels* punished for their sins as they were commit-

ted? or, in other words, was God judging and punishing them, and at the same time RESERVING them *unto* some future *day of judgment to be punished?!*

Jude speaks of "the judgment of the GREAT DAY." But it may be asked: Did you not take the ground at the commencement, that the *day* of judgment was to be understood literally? I certainly did, and say so still.—But does this not contradict the idea of its being a *great day.* It is known to all nations, that the fourth day of July, among the American people, is a GREAT DAY. Not because it is twenty-six hours long! for it is a literal day, and the same as other days, in this respect; but it is a *great day*, because upon that *day great transactions* occur. So will it be in the GREAT DAY of God Almighty, when he shall convocate the immense posterity of Adam, into the presence of his awful majesty, to know their doom. Such indeed, will be a great and important transaction, and such can truly be called "the great and terrible day of the Lord?"

7 "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." (Heb. 9. 27, 28.)

Remarks: Universalists have two ways of interpreting this text. We shall examine both. They tell us that "after *this* the judgment," does not mean after *death;* but after *this* appointment! Now if such language as the above text proves that the judgment is before death, then I have lost all idea, or else never had any, of the correct combination of words into sentences. Let us now look at a few grammatical parallels, which will probably explain this: It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the funeral: that is, according to Universalism, he must have his funeral sermon preached *before he dies!!* Again: It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this be buried: that is, after *this* appointment, but he must be buried before death! Once more: It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the resurrection: that is, men will all be raised from the

dead, before they die!! This is a sufficient expose of this criticism. Such outrageous quibbles are only got up for effect, as any one can see; for Universalists are most unmerciful in their lampoonings, if a man, in quoting the above text, should say "*after death*," instead of "*after this*." But suppose the text did really read, "after *death* the judgment," Universalists could dispose of it, in the same manner as they do with scores of other texts, as pointed and as emphatic as this: that is, it is all a figure: *death* is to be understood in a moral sense and cannot be understood literally!

But now for the other exposition! We are told that *tois anthropois*, here translated *men*, should have been rendered *these men*, meaning the Jewish high priests, who, by going into the holiest of holies, *died typically*, and after this came out and *blessed* the people, or judged them! I know not who was the original inventor of this singular piece of machinery; neither do I care; but one thing is certain, that it is now in as common use among Universalists from Maine to the Mississippi Valley, as Evans's safety valve is among engineers. Hence let this exposition prove a failure, and Universalism upon this text, will be like mighty Sampson when shorn of his locks. We shall now present several reasons, why *tois anthropois* does not, and cannot mean the Jewish high priests.

1. *Tois anthropois* should not be translated *these men*, or *those men*, as Universalists contend; for, in all their efforts to give it this signification, they have never as yet brought forward one example, from the whole bible, where the word is thus translated! This proves to an occular demonstration, that no such example is to be found; for if such a text there be, they would most unquestionably have adduced it; as they have invariably done in all such cases, where they could! This one argument weighs mightily against Universalism. Gentlemen: *tois* is an *article:* Did you ever know this? And did you ever read a text where the *Greek article* was translated *these*, or *those?* No, *never!*

2. *The dying* here spoken of, was not figurative; or

else Christ *died* nothing but a figurative death; for the text reads: "*So* Christ was once offered," that is, in like manner; and if it was only figurative, then he was not a real, but a figurative sacrifice,—made nothing but a figurative atonement, and no man, at most, can have any more than a figurative salvation through him! But if Christ died a literal death, then the death of the *tois anthropois* was also literal; which proves beyond controversy, that it does not signify the high priest in the holy place; for the Lord laid down this law: "And it shall be upon Aaron to minister; and his sound shall be heard when he goeth in unto the holy place before the Lord, and when he cometh out, THAT HE DIE NOT." [Ex. 28. 35.]

3. The high priest going through the blue veil of the temple, into the holy place, was not a typical death, but typified exactly the opposite of death, as it was a type of Christ entering through the blue veil,—the cerulean curtain of the skies, into the enjoyment of an "*endless life*." What death did Christ die, after he had entered into the true holy place? Thus, instead of the high priest dying a typical *death*, when he went into the holy place, he entered into a typical *life*, which levels to the dust the very bulwarks of Universalism upon this subject, and its advocates will *feel it*, if I am not greatly deceived.

4. If the high priest *going into* the most holy place, was the dying here referred to, then the apostle was sadly mistaken; for instead of its being appointed unto *these* men *once* to die, they had to die every year, for Paul declares: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God; but into the *second*, [the most holy place] went the high priest alone *once every year*." [Heb. 9. 6, 7.] Hence it cannot mean the typical death of the high priest, any way it can be fixed; for instead of dying *once*, as the text declares, by the time he was sixty years old, he had died *thirty times!*

5. This text cannot have reference to the Jewish high priest; for, after he came out of the holy place, instead of *judging* the people, he *blessed* them. Thus we read:

"And Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people, and *blessed* them, and came down from offering of the sin offering,—and Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, and came out, and *blessed* the people." [Lev. 9. 22, 23.] But Universalists contend that the word *blessing* signifies *judgment*. Let us now try their own definition with the promise to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be *judged*." If a *general or universal judgment*, be the *blessing* included in the promise to Abraham, then we have no objection to Universalists making all the capital out of that promise they can!

6. If a *typical death* is what we are to understand by the text, then *tois anthropois*, signifies the animals that were slain outside of the camp; for their death typified the death of Christ, outside of the gates of Jerusalem!—Hence, instead of saying "*men*," as the apostle does, he should have said: "It is appointed unto the *lambs* and *bullocks*, *once to die*, and after this be *roasted*." Universalists are bound to admit, that this exposition is far preferable to theirs, and that it comes more than five times as near the truth.

7. Universalists make great ado, if any one should happen to quote the text in this way: "It is appointed unto *all men* once to die, and after this the judgment." But with all their ridiculing, and sarcastic slang about making a new bible, etc., it can be demonstrated to be the true meaning of the text. Turn to your bible, and read Acts 17. 30: "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commands ALL MEN EVERY WHERE to repent;" and then turn to your Greek Testament, and you will there find that very same knotty little word *tois anthropois*, that Universalists have been trying, for the last fifty years, to drive into the *sanctum sanctorum!* Let us now read the text in Heb. 9. 27 in this way, and we have the true idea of the apostle. "It is appointed unto ALL MEN EVERY WHERE once to die, and after this the judgment."! We hope Universalists will now be *satisfied*, and that we shall hear no more of their learned

blustering about *tois anthropois*, and the Jewish high priests!

8. "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, are kept in store reserved unto fire, *against the day of judgment*, and the *perdition of ungodly men*." [2 Pet. 3. 7.]

Remarks: This text is most clear and emphatic, in pointing out the day of judgment, and the perdition of ungodly men, not only as still future, but simultaneous with the end of time, and the dissolution of this earth by fire. The only way Universalists have ever tried to evade this most sweeping declaration, is by taking the ground that it is a figurative representation of the destruction of the Jewish dispensation, at the downfall of Jerusalem. They say it is inconsistent to suppose, that this earth will ever be on fire literally, as here described by the apostle; notwithstanding it is perfectly natural for a dispensation to *melt* and *burn up!* They argue, also, that there was a day of judgment at the close of the antediluvian age, when the wicked were destroyed by the flood:—that there was also a judgment at the conclusion of the dispensation before the law, when the wicked Egyptians were destroyed in the Red Sea; and that there should be a day of judgment at the breaking up of the Jewish economy. This is all reasonable, and consistent, we freely admit, and with a very little restriction, is the true state of the case; and this being so, we ask, where is the impropriety of their being a day of general judgment at the closing up of the christian dispensation? Why should the christian age differ from all others? Universalists are compelled to admit, according to their own logic, and upon the principles of consistency, that there will be a general judgment at the close of this dispensation! But the judgment at the flood, at the Red sea, and at the destruction of Jerusalem, were all temporal judgments, and never spoken of as "*the day of judgment*," once in the whole bible.

Let us now inquire, if the earth, which is to be reno-

vated by fire at the day of judgment, is to be understood literally, or as having reference only to an age or dispensation. Universalists acknowledge, that the earth was literally deluged with water; and we have an abundance of testimony to prove that it underwent some change or transformation, which was considered a *destruction*.—Peter says it "*perished*," and God said to Noah: "I will establish my covenant with you, neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood, neither shall there any more be a flood to *destroy the earth*." [Gen. 9. 11.] Peter keeps up the contrast, between the earth that then was, and the earth that is now: one being literally deluged and renovated by water; and the other being destined to be as literally deluged, and renovated, or regenerated by fire: for God declares: "Behold I make *all things new*." [Rev. 21. 5.] This old earth, or the earth in its old sin-worn and sin-polutled state, is to pass away. God said to Noah: "While the *earth remaineth*;" [Gen. 8. 22.] showing plainly, that it was not always to remain. Christ also testifies: "Verily I say unto you: *till heaven and earth pass*." [Math. 5. 18.] This shows that there will be a time, when heaven and earth shall *pass*. Again: "*Heaven and earth shall pass away*, but my words shall not pass away." [Math. 24. 35.] Paul, however, puts the question forever at rest, and shows that the heavens and the earth, which are to be destroyed, and pass away, must be understood literally, as meaning this physical Universe, which God has created. "And thou Lord in the *beginning* hast laid the FOUNDATION OF THE EARTH; and the *heavens* are the *works of thy hands*; they shall PERISH, but thou remainest; and they all shall *waxe old* as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou FOLD THEM UP, and *they shall be changed*." [Heb. 1. 10–12.] This proves that the literal earth which we now inhabit, the foundations of which God laid in the *beginning*, is to be *destroyed* and *changed*: and when can this take place, but at the time marked out by Peter,—the day of judgment, and the perdition *of ungodly men*? The candid and intelligent reader *must* decide for himself.

9. "And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked,—the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation; and reserve the *unjust* unto the *day of* JUDGMENT *to be punished.*" [2 Pet. 2. 7, 9.]

Remarks: The certainty of a future judgment, at the resurrection of the dead, is so clearly sustained from this text, that it needs not a comment. The Sodomites, the very characters who vexed the soul of righteous Lot, with their unlawful deeds; are now being reserved, to some future *day of judgment* to be punished: which cannot be until the Sodomites are raised from the dead!—How will Universalists reconcile this with their theory, of receiving in full for their sins, every day as they go along? Does God reserve men till some future day to be punished, and punish them all the while he is reserving them? But we have another text which will confirm this, and dispel all doubt concerning its being yet future.

10. "Wo unto thee Chorazin, wo unto thee Bethsaida,—it *shall be* more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the DAY OF JUDGMENT, than for you. And thou Capernium which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell,—it *shall be* more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the DAY OF JUDGMENT than for thee." [Math. 11. 21–24.]

Remarks: The plain, unvarnished, and unsophistical force of this text, defies the ingenuity of Universalism. It is here most unequivocally stated, that the men of Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom, are all to be in the day of judgment, still in the future. These characters were all in eternity, hundreds of years before Christ made this statement; yet they "SHALL BE" in some future *day of judgment*, with the people of Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernium. Was this at the destruction of Jerusalem? I think hardly! nor never will be till the dead are raised. But Universalists try to make out that the Sodomites will be raised holy and happy, by appealing to

the prophesy of Ezekiel. We shall follow them thither, as we wish to ferret the system, out of its most obscure hiding places, and search it, as with a lighted candle. The following language is quoted in proof of the above position. "When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of *Sodom* and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them:—When thy sisters Sodom and her daughters shall return to their former estate; and Samaria and her daughters shall return to their former estate; then thou and thy daughters shall return to your former estate.—And I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame, when I am *pacified* toward thee, for all that thou has done, saith the Lord God." [Ezek. 16. 53, 55, 62, 63.] Here then is their testimony, in favor of the Sodomites at the resurrection of the the dead. But how did Universalists happen to find out so quick that this was all literal? This is indeed a——no, not a mystery; for they thought it favored Universalism, and therefore *must be literal*, no mistake about that! But had the words DAMNATION, HELL, or JUDGMENT happened to have occurred in this connection, the whole matter would have been immediately converted in a bundle of rhetroical figures!

Now just to accommodate these very accommodating gentlemen, we will admit the whole representation to be literal: although there is as much reason for its being figurative, as for any other prediction in the bible. The text declares, that "Sodom and her daughters shall return to their *former estate*," as Universalists understand it, at the resurrection. This proves that they will be *sinful* and *miserable* in the resurrection, for such they were, and such was their *former estate*, before they were destroyed! Truly, if the text comes no nearer the mark than this, it will take it a long time to prove *Universalism*. Again, the text reads, "that thou mayest re-

member and *be confounded.*" Ah, and that too in the resurrection! Are they to be *believers*, and at the same time be *confounded?* No, for Peter says: "He that believeth on him, [Christ] shall not be confounded." [1 Pet. 2. 6.] Then they are unbelievers in eternity, and consequently condemned, for, "He that believeth not is condemned already." (John 3. 18.) But the text also says they are to be *ashamed*, and hence they are not the people of God, for God says: "My people shall *never be ashamed.*" (Joel 2. 26.) But worse and worse! The text declares, that they shall "never open their mouths *any more.*" Is this the way Universalists intend to sing the songs of redeeming love? by never opening their mouths *any more?* How long is "any more?" You remember the Universalist text in Luke 20. 36. "Neither can they die *any more!*" that is, they shall not die to all eternity. From this we can come at something like an idea, of what the Universalist salvation of the Sodomites will consist in. They will not be the people of God, for they will be *ashamed*,—they will be *confounded*,—they will be *condemned*, and they will have to keep their mouths shut eternally! This is a specimen of the beauty, glory, and sublimity of Universalism.

But what is to be done with this? God says he is to be *pacified* towards them. Let us inquire, what is meant by the word pacify? Universalists say it means to be reconciled. It occurs in only one other place in the bible, and that is Est. 7. 10. "So they hanged Haman on the gallows that he had prepared for Mordecai. Then was the king's wrath *pacified.*" Thus may God be *pacified* towards the Sodomites, after the resurrection, when he has *confounded*, and *condemned* them, and sentenced them eternally to shut their mouths!

11. "The men of Nineveh shall RISE IN JUDGMENT with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the South shall RISE UP IN JUDGMENT with this generation,

and shall condemn it, for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth, to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here." [Math. 12. 41, 42.]

Remarks: If this does not prove a judgment at the resurrection, then it is not in the power of language to express such a sentiment. The men of Nineveh, and the queen of Sheba, although having been dead, and in their graves for hundreds of years; still the Saviour points to the future, and declares that they "*shall rise up in judgment.*" When can this be, but at the resurrection? Mark the word "RISE UP;" *egersis* in the Greek, and the precise word employed by the apostle in the 15th of 1st Cor. which Universalists acknowledge and contend, refers to the literal resurrection of the dead.—Thus we have it incontrovertibly established, that in the literal resurrection, the men of Nineveh and the queen of Sheba, shall *rise up in* JUDGMENT. I cannot see how a Universalist would attempt to evade this testimony.

12. "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law, in THE DAY, when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel." [Rom. 2. 12, 16.]

Remarks: I have quoted the connection, by leaving out the parenthesis. This text informs us, that "*as many*, [i. e. *all*] that have sinned in the law, [including as a matter of course, those who sinned, and fell in the wilderness] SHALL BE JUDGED by the law." This teaches unequivocally, that those who had sinned in the law, and had been dead for more than a thousand years, were still to be judged, in some *future day*, which cannot be till the resurrection, when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ *according to the gospel.* This is the same DAY which God has appointed, "in the which he WILL JUDGE THE WORLD in righteousness, by *that man* whom he hath ordained." Does this relate to

the destruction of Jerusalem? Not quite: for those dead sinners were not raised at that time; neither were those, who were present on that occasion, judged according to the GOSPEL, but according to the law of Moses. (Read Deu. 28.) Hence it is incontrovertible, that the day of judgment is still future, and will not take place till the DEAD ARE RAISED.

13. "I saw the dead, both small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works: and death and hell were cast into the lake of fire: this is the second death." [Rev. 20. 12–14.]

Remarks: Universalists do not pretend to reconcile this text with their doctrine. They do, however, try to evade its force, by resorting to their old thread-bare, hacknied assumption, of *figure*, *allegory*, *metaphor*, etc. They try to make this out a figurative representation of things which belong exclusively to this world, from the fact that this punishment is to continue "*day and night* forever and ever." (Verse 10.) But how happens it that "*day and night*" is to be understood *literally* all at once, whilst the whole connection is figurative? This is one of the great and marvellous things of Universalism! As they admit the phrase "day and night" to be literal, it will puzzle a Jesuit to prove, that the *judgment* of the dead, both small and great, is all a figure! We are frequently told very shrewdly, that the phrase "day and night" cannot at all refer to the state beyond the resurrection. Well let us see. The *Pro* and *Con* of Universalism, by George Rogers, on page 106, quotes Rev. 7. 9, and applies it to the resurrection state. "And after this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people,

and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, *clothed with white robes*, and palms in their hands." This, let it be remembered, is quoted to prove, that after the resurrection all mankind are to be saved; for they shall wear "*white robes*." It does not however teach this doctrine, although we admit with them that it refers to the *post* resurrection state: for mark the fact, it was not all kindreds, people, tongues, &c., but it was "a great multitude OF all nations, and kindred, and people, and tongues," which makes the matter widely different. But let us read on concerning this great multitude. "And one of the elders answered saying unto me, what are these, which are arrayed in *white robes*, and whence come they? And I said, sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, these are they which come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb: therefore are they before the throne of God, *and serve him* DAY AND NIGHT *in his temple*." (Ibid. 15–17.) Here then, Universalists have to admit, that "day and night" in the Revelations, may, and actually does apply to eternity. But if this judgment scene, being measured by words strictly applicable only to time, is a proof that it is confined to this world exclusively, then upon the same principle, the existence of God will end with the history of time; for it is said concerning him: "Thou art the same, and thy *years* shall not fail." (Heb. 1. 12.) But again, we have the testimony of *Pro* and *Con*, proving to an absolute certainty that this scene of judgment, described by the Revelator, refers to the resurrection state. We shall give a quotation from page 119.

Hell is fated to the same end, [i. e. destruction.] God says by the prophet, "I will ransom them from the power of *sheol*, (grave or hell;) I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues. O sheol, I will be thy destruction." (Hos. 13. 14.) John's description (highly figurative unquestionably) MUST REFER TO THE SAME EVENT. "And death and hades were cast into the lake *of fire: this* is the second death." Here the destruction *of death itself* is termed the second death.

Very good, friend George: you admit then, do you, when men shall be delivered from the power of the grave, and when *death* shall be destroyed, that then and there will be the lake of fire and brimstone described by the Revelator? Yes you do! And you have not forgotten your favorite text—1. Cor. 15. 26, which also declares that death the last enemy "*shall be destroyed*" at the resurrection; which you admit, and contend to be yet future! Now, sir, since the lake of fire is to be at the resurrection of the dead, we shall let John tell you what else besides death and hades is to be cast into it, at that time! If you take part of his testimony upon this subject; you are bound to take all. "And *whosoever* was not found written in the *book of life*, was cast into the lake of fire," (verse 15,) *at the resurrection of the dead!* Mark this! Again: "But the *fearful* and *unbelieving*, and the *abominable*, and *murderers*, and *whoremongers*, and *sorcerers*, and *idolaters*, and *all liars*, shall have their part in *the lake* which burneth with fire and brimstone: WHICH IS THE SECOND DEATH." (Rev. 21. 8.) And all too, at the *resurrection;* for so testifies Paul, so testifies John, and so testifies George! And it must be true; for "In the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be established." (2 Cor. 13. 1.)

14. "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust; and HEREIN do I EXERCISE MYSELF, to have always a conscience void of offence, toward God, and toward men." [Acts 24. 15, 16.]

Remarks: Universalists never quote verse 16; for that appears to favor the idea, that Paul *exercised himself*, and cultivated his disposition, with direct reference to this general resurrection of which he speaks: Hence this much of Paul's testimony must be kept behind the curtain. Universalists admit, without hesitation, that this text relates to the same resurrection, upon which Paul treats in 1 Cor. 15. But they contend that the

text does not teach that men will be *unjust* when they are raised: for Paul, they say, must have possessed the spirit of a demon, to hope for the resurrection of men to damnation! But Universalists contend that Paul hoped; and exhorted the disciples to hope, for the coming of the Lord, at the destruction of Jerusalem, to destroy and masacre the Jews by thousands; and yet it would be inconsistant, for Paul to hope for the resurrection of the wicked to justice! But the truth is, every righteous man must hope and desire, that justice and righteousness will be done; if it should even consist in the resurrection of the wicked to eternal damnation.—Like the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, crying under the altar: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood, on them that dwell on the earth?" [Rev. 6. 10.] God has said, in many places, that he will raise the wicked to damnation; and the Judge of all the earth will do right. Now cannot a christian consistently hope for God to do what is right? If so, then he can with all propriety, hope for the resurrection of the unjust to condemnation; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. And God would not say he would do a thing that was wrong! But Universalists have a similitude, which, like their exposition of *tois anthropois*, has gone the grand rounds, and is pat in the mouth of every braggadocio in the fraternity. Suppose, say they, I should hope for the resurrection of all the Methodists and Presbyterians in this house, would it follow, that I hoped they would be raised Methodists and Presbyterians? or that they would continue thus after they were raised? I answer no! But the case is not at all parallel. Paul hoped, not for the resurrection of the just and of the unjust who were alive; put for the resurrection of the DEAD, both JUST and UNJUST. This proves that they remain JUST and UNJUST after DEATH; and that the same distinction is kept up after men leave this world, that exists before it. Now suspose it to be a fact, that men do *actually* remain Methodists and Presbyterians, after

they die, the same as they are now; and a man should hope for a resurrection of the DEAD, both Methodists and Presbyterians; would it not be perfectly natural and consistent to infer from his language, that he expected them to be Methodists and Presbyterians at the resurrection, as much as before it? Most certainly. This exactly meets the case; and the originator and retailers of the above similitude, have not perception enough to detect its fallacy, and inappropriateness; or seeing it, they have not enough candor to confess it. Now since Universalists freely admit the resurrection of the *just*, as well as of the *unjust* to be literal; let us ask the Saviour, whether there will be any distinction at that time, between the righteous and the wicked? He answers: "Thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST." [Luke 14. 14.] Thus at the resurrection of the *just*, the righteous shall be rewarded for their deeds in this life; and upon the same principle, at the resurrection of the *unjust*, the wicked will receive their condemnation!

The whole bible carries out the idea of the same distinction existing between saints and sinners,—*just* and *unjust*, after death, as before it. When Christ arose, we are informed that "the graves were opened; and many bodies of the *saints* which slept arose." [Math. 27. 52.] If there is no difference after death between *saints*, and those who *die in their sins;* why then this partiality towards the dead saints? Why not on this occasion, have raised the bodies of the wicked, as well as of the righteous, and thus have demonstrated the truth of Universalism? How easy this would have been: but Universalism was not true, and hence, none of the wicked arose, proving that the same distinction exists between saints and sinners, both in time and in eternity.

15. "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works,

and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of *resurrection of the dead*, and of ETERNAL JUDGMENT." [Heb. 6. 1–3.]

Remarks: What testimony could be more positive than this, that the day of judgment is beyond the resurrection? If the idea could be conveyed, in language more definite and unequivocal, I should be extremely curious to know how it would be fixed! The apostle here informs us, that one of the principles of the gospel, is the *resurrection of the dead;* and the one immediately following this, is the "ETERNAL JUDGMENT!" This cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, for two reasons: 1. The dead were not *raised* at that time, but right the opposite,—many thousands were killed; and 2. The calamity brought upon the Jewish nation, was not an *eternal judgment*, but the whole affair was of a temporal character. But this *eternal judgment* must necessarily belong to the *eternal state* of existence; and hence, as the apostle here affirms, it will take place subsequently to the *resurrection of the dead!* This however is but a sample of the evidence we have yet to adduce.

16. "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all *stand* before the JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST: for it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." [Rom. 14. 10, 11.]

Remarks: This language was written many years after the christian dispensation had commenced, and the apostle still speaks of the judgment seat of Christ as being future. Neither can it mean the destruction of Jerusalem. For all the saints at Rome were certainly not taken seventeen hundred miles, to appear before Titus, at his contest with the Jews! And moreover, Paul, (as was unquestionably the case with many addressed at that time,) was dead, and in his grave, before ever the judgment seat of Titus was erected. But Universalists themselves shall now decide, to what period the apostle re-

fers to this language. You recollect that Is. 45. 23, is quoted as incontrovertible evidence, that the whole human family will be saved at the resurrection; because *there* and *then* the Almighty declares, that "every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess!" This text is thus quoted and applied, by every Universalist in christendom. Now, reader, take notice of this most unanswerable fact; that Paul quotes the same text precisely, which Universalists universally apply to the resurrection, and proves by it that we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, at the same time when this *bowing* and *confessing* shall take place!! This settles the question forever with Universalism; and its advocates are inevitably compelled, from their own premises, to admit the JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST to be at THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD!! So stands the matter now; and unless Universalists abandon Is. 45. in toto, the world cannot redeem their doctrine from utter destruction!—But every body knows, that they will not yield up Is. 45. as it is one of their strongest grounds; hence the doctrine is gone by the board! "Amen! even so let it be."

17. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" [Math. 23. 33.]

Remarks: The only way Universalists have tried to evade this text, and keep it from teaching a future retribution, is by contending that the word *gehenna*, here translated hell, literally signifies the valley of *Hinnom*, a short distance from Jerusalem; and that the Saviour here makes use of the word in that sense. Here again is one of those strange and marvellous things of Universalism,—that almost every passage in the bible, which speaks of punishment, hell, or judgment, is to be understood metaphorically! but in this case, it is most unquestionably literal; because if it should happen to mean any thing, except the literal valley of *Hinnom*, it would cut at the very heart of Universalism, and make it to wither like Jonah's gourd!

Let us now examine into the meaning of this word, as here employed by the Saviour. The fact that Christ threatened the scribes and pharisees, with the damnation of hell, proves that they were liable to this damnation; for, to say that he would threaten men with something of which there was no possible danger, would be to charge the Lord with folly and deception. This being the case, then the word *hell* does not mean the valley of *Hinnom*, for of this the scribes and pharisees were in no danger. But suppose they were: who was there to inflict this punishment? Was Christ to throw them into the valley of Hinnom? No; for he says: "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." [Luke 9. 56.] Did Christ design, that the apostles should inflict this punishment? No, for he commands them to "resist not evil," and "whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." [Math. 5. 39; 7. 12.] Now the disciples would not wish men to throw them into the valley of *Hinnom;* and hence they would not do so to them, if they obeyed the Saviour. Neither *could* they, had they been disposed; for that matter belonged exclusively to the civil authority. Consequently, if that punishment be inflicted at all, it would be done by the Jews, who were at the head of government. But who were these Jews? They were these very scribes and pharisees, whom Christ threatened with the damnation of hell! And is it very likely, that they would inflict this punishment upon themselves? If they would not, there was nobody else that could; and hence, the *damnation of hell*, of which the scribes and pharisees were in danger, was not the valley of Hinnom! Mark this! When Christ put the question to them: "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" they might have replied, had they understood him the way Universalists now do: We can escape it easily enough; for this hell of which you speak, we have in our own hands, and we were never in the least danger of it; neither would we punish any body, with the damnation of *our hell*, *for the* offences you speak of; for we, ourselves, are the

very men who have committed those offences. There would be more propriety in letting your inquiry be directed to your disciples,—how can you escape the damnation of hell? for they doubtless will be the very first candidates for this punishment. But be assured, that we shall not hurt any man with the fires of *Hinnom*, much less ourselves, for disobeying your word! This would undoubtedly have been the reply of the pharisees, if Christ in his remarks, had reference to the valley of Hinnom. But suppose the Lord meant: How can you escape the destruction of Jerusalem? The pharisees might have replied: By slipping our necks into the halter, and swinging off to heaven before that time rolls round!! How completely would a Universalist have confounded the Lord had he been in the place of one of those scribes! But suppose the Saviour meant: How can you escape the damnation of a guilty conscience? They might have replied: By sinning ahead as hard as we can, until out "consciences are seared with a hot iron," and we get "past feeling!"

From the foregoing, we consider the point incontrovertibly established, that the *damnation of hell* does not, and cannot refer to any punishment to be inflicted in this life; and must consequently refer to the future state of existence! But we shall now introduce another argument which stands very immediately connnected with this, which must, in the mind of every candid reader, remove the last vestige of doubt upon this subject.

18. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." [Math. 10. 28.]

Remarks: The ground taken by Universalists upon this text, is known to all, who are acquainted with the doctrine, to be this: The soul here spoken of means the animal life;—the one whom they were to fear, signifies the rulers of the Jews; and the hell in which both soul and body was to be destroyed, has reference to the val-

ley of Hinnom. We shall examine these points in regular order.

1. Does the soul here mean the animal life? It cannot. Every one knows, that when the body is killed, the animal life is destroyed; and hence it is all nonsense to talk of *destroying the soul*, and the *body*, as two things separate and distinct. More than this, the Saviour testifies, as recorded by Luke, that this destruction of both soul and body in hell, is to take place after men are killed, or after the animal life is destroyed: which proves, that the soul has reference to the spirit, or that principle which lives after the body is dead. "And I say unto you my friends; be not afraid of them that *kill the body*, and after that have *no more* that they can do: but I will forwarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which *after he hath killed*, hath power to *cast into hell;* yea I say unto you fear him." [Luke 12. 4, 5.] From this it is established, and let it be remembered, that the casting into hell, or the destruction of both soul and body, is to take place *after the body is killed;* and consequently after the animal life is destroyed; which proves, that the *soul* does not, and cannot mean the animal life! Why is it, that the Saviour should be guilty of committing such unpardonable blunders, as speaking of killing the body, in contradistinction to destroying the soul, if the soul signifies the animal life? The very instant the body was killed, that instant the animal life would be destroyed; for they are precisely *one*, and the same thing! Suppose we look at the instructions of the Lord, in the light of Universalism. "Fear not them which kill the body, [that is, which destroy the *animal life*,] but are not able to kill the soul, [that is, are not able to destroy the *animal life*,] but rather fear him, who after he has killed the body, [that is, destroyed the *animal life*,] is able to destroy both *soul* and *body* in hell," that is, he is able to destroy both the *animal life*, and the *animal life* in hell!! Thus Universalism makes the Saviour teach, not only that man has power to destroy the *animal life*, and that he has not got power to destroy the *animal life*: and also that some oth-

er man has so much power, that, after he has destroyed the *animal life*, he is able to destroy is twice more in the valley of Hinnom!!! If such were the teachings of Christ, well might the Jews say as they did: "Never man spake like this man;" that is, no man ever spake such consummate nonsense!

2. But who were they commanded to fear? This question is easily answered, by taking into consideration the fact, that no man had power to do more than kill the body. Hence the Saviour says: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body; but after that have *no more* that they can do." But there is a being, who has infinitely more power than man; who, after the body is dead, has power to kill the *soul* in hell,—I say unto you, *fear him*. The object of the Saviour's instruction on this occasion, was to arm his disciples with christian fortitude, and to nerve them with a holy, and courageous zeal, that they might be enabled to bear up without fear, under the bitterest persecution, and the most dreadful tortures that the ingenuity of man could invent; and even to submit, with resignation, to death itself, which they were assured was the very utmost extent of the power of man. Is is at all likely? is it possible, that the Lord Jesus Christ, (after thus admonishing them to fear no punishment which could be inflicted by the power of man,) would turn right round in the same sentence, and contradict himself by telling them to be exceedingly fearful of the Jews, who had power to cast them into the valley of Hinnom? Strange logic, truly; yet it is positively the conclusion into which we are driven by following out the principles of this most hypocritical system of infidelity; cloaked as it is, under the profession of faith in divine revelation. The Saviour warns us to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing. And I consider myself as performing the best possible service to my countrymen, if I should succeed in stripping the *wool* from these creatures, that when they howl and chatter their teeth, all flesh may know just what they are, and what trap to set for them! But the Saviour did not contradict himself in this man-

ner. When the church was suffering the most violent calamities, from the hands of her enemies, the Lord says: "*Fear none of those things that shall come upon you.*" [Rev. 2. 10.] The apostle Paul writes to the brethren: "In *nothing* be terrified by your adversaries." [Ph. 1. 28.] This same apostle also, after taking a view of the promises of God, comes to the following conclusion: "The Lord is my helper, and *I will not fear what man shall do unto me.*" [Heb. 13. 6.] According to Universalism, the apostle Paul had come to the conclusion, that, the Lord being his helper, he would disobey Christ; for he was determined not to fear any thing that man could do, notwithstanding Christ had commanded him right the reverse,—to fear what the Jews could do to him, by throwing him into the fire!! We have now shown, and we think incontrovertibly too, that the *one*, whom Jesus Christ taught his disciples to fear, *was not man;* and Universalists will not say he meant the devil; hence it must mean the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us now see if this can be sustained. "Honor all men, love the brotherhood, *fear* God, and honor the king." [1 Pet. 2. 17.] "Serve the Lord *with fear*, and rejoice with *trembling*." [Ps. 2. 11.] "Let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and *godly fear*." [Heb. 12. 28.] "It is a *fearful thing* to fall into the hands of the living God." [Heb. 10. 31.] From these testimonies we discover, that it is God whom we are to fear, and hence, the one who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell, is that being, into whose hands "it is a *fearful thing to fall!*"

3. Having thus demolished two-thirds of the citadel of our opponents, upon this subject; we proceed to the other. What are we to understand by the word *hell?* From the foregoing, it will be but an easy task, to give a most satisfactory answer to this long litigated question. 1. We have seen that it was God, and not man, who is to destroy both soul and body in hell; and he had no hand in putting men into the valley of Hinnom. Hence, that cannot be the *hell* here spoken of! Mark *this!*—

2. We have seen that the *soul* does not, and cannot here signify the animal life; but it is unquestionably the *spirit*, or that principle which lives after the body is killed, and the animal life has become extinct. This is another insurmountable reason, why *hell* cannot mean the valley of Hinnom; for Universalists themselves will not contend that the fires of Hinnom can destroy the *spirit!* But should they turn materialists, (the way some of them already have,) and contend that the soul and body die together, it will not help the case in the least: for any other way of killing the body would destroy the soul, (or the spirit,) just as easily as the fires of Hinnom: and thus again, the Saviour is made to talk the most ineffable nonsense. 3. We have seen that this destruction of *soul* and *body*, is to take place after the death of the body, and consequently after the soul and body are separated. Hence this destruction cannot take place till the resurrection, when soul and body shall be reunited. And since we have positive proof that it cannot mean the death of the body; (i. e. the *first* death,) and since Christ does actually speak of it as *killing the soul;* it follows hence, that this language has reference to the *second death*, "in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone;" or the "*fiery indignation* which shall devour the adversaries." All this is to take place, at the day of judgment,—the resurrection, when the dead, small and great, shall stand before God. The lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death, is the true, and scriptural definition of that *hell*, in which the souls and bodies of the wicked are to be destroyed; and I am certain that this position cannot be got over by the combined power of a whole regiment of Universalists. But it is said that *hell* cannot signify the lake of fire, because we read, that death and *hell* shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death. Was hell cast into itself? But stop one minute, sir, and the difficulty will disappear. *That hell*, which is defined by inspiration to be the "lake of fire and brimstone," is, as I have already observed, translated from the Greek word ge-

henna, but *that hell*, which is to be cast into this *gehenna*, or *lake of fire*, is *hades*, in Greek, a different word altogether; and signifies the *grave*, or the *unseen world!* But again it may be urged, that although this definition of *gehenna* may be correct, still it does not prove that any one will ever experience this destruction; for the text simply states that he is *able* to destroy both soul and body in hell,—not that he *will* do it! Upon this we remark, in the first place, that it is charging Jesus Christ with the most contemptible trifling, in holding out as an inducement, or a reason why men should fear God, a punishment which he knew did not, nor never would exist, and of which no man ever was, or ever will be in the least possible danger. Such pitiful hypocrisy is more worthy of being ranked among old wive's fables, than among the sayings of him who "taught righteousness where great assemblies stood." He was not guilty of such gross impositions, and no such folly and deception can be justly imputed to the Son of God. But we shall now show that the fact of God, or of Christ being able to do a thing, is proof that he will do it! "Whereby he is *able* even to subdue all things unto himself." [Ph. 3. 21.] Does not this prove, that he will subdue all things unto himself? Universalists say so. Again: "Wherefore he is *able* also to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him." [Heb. 7. 25.] All parties will admit this to be the same, as though the apostle had said: "*He will* save to the uttermost," &c. Having thus clearly proved, that it is God whom we are to fear, and not the rulers of the Jews;—that the *soul* means the immortal spirit, and not the animal life;—that *hell* signifies the *lake of fire and brimstone*, or the *second death* beyond the resurrection, and not the valley of Hinnom,—and that God will actually, at that time, destroy the souls and bodies of the wicked: we therefore leave the matter for the reader's reflection and decision!

19. "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom,

The rich man also died, and was buried, and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." [Luke 16. 22, 23.]

Remarks: The case of the rich man and Lazarus, has been discussed and rediscussed, until I cannot presume to say much upon the subject, that will be new or interesting. However, I shall try to add something. The only way Universalists have ever tried to dispose of the matter, is by making it out nothing but a parable. But in this case, as we have seen in scores of others, Universalists are but laying a snare for themselves. Although we are perfectly willing to admit the representation to be a parable; yet we ask Universalists how they can prove it? Their answer always is: Because it is recorded: "Without a parable spake he not unto them." [Math. 13. 34.] Very good! Then all that Christ taught the Jews, was spoken in parables, and does not refer to the future state, but is applicable only to this life. Let this be remembered. Now let us ask the Rev. Mr. Universalism, to declare unto us this parable? "In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage,—neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." [Math. 22. Luke 20.] This, be it remembered, was spoken to the Jews, and remember also, that without a parable spake he not unto them; and remember in the third place, that Universalism teaches, that a parable cannot state a literal fact; and that when it refers to the future world, still it represents facts which belong exclusively to this! What now becomes of their resurrection holiness, themselves being judges? The very plan they will adopt to make this parable state facts literally, as they will occur in eternity, I will apply to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and defy Universalism to budge it a hair's breadth! These parabolical gentlemen contend, that the notion of a *hell*, *punishment*, or *judgment* beyond this life, was a vagary,—a sheer humbuggery, derived by the Jews from heathen mythology; and that it had no *real* foundation; but existed only in the imagination; and that Christ had

reference to this, *when* he spake the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. But I challenge the whole fraternity of Universalists, to put their finger upon a single parable, out of the whole number which Christ spake, and show that he ever, in a single instance, predicated a parable upon a phantasm, a visionary chimerical speculation, which had no real existence! It is utterly impossible! We shall look at one, as a fair sample of all the rest.—"A certain man went down from *Jerusalem* to *Jericho*, and fell among *thieves*, which *stripped* him of his *raiment*, and *wounded* him, and departed, leaving him *half dead*. And by chance there came down a certain *priest* that way, and when he saw him he passed by on the other side. And likewise a *Levite*, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side. But a certain *Samaritan* as he *journeyed*, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him: and went to him, and *bound up his wounds*, pouring in *oil* and *wine*, and set him on his own *beast*, and brought him to an *inn*, and took care of him. And on the *morrow* when he departed, he took out *two pence*, and gave them to the *host*." [Luke 10. 30–35.] Permit me now to ask the intelligent reader, if this parable is predicated upon a chimera? It commences in the same way, and is precisely of the same character as the one under examination? Had *Jerusalem* and *Jericho* no real existence? Were there no such men as *thieves*? and was there never such a thing as a man being *stripped* of his *raiment*, *wounded*, and left *half dead*? Were there no such men in existence as *priests*, *Levites*, and *Samaritans*? Was the existence of *oil*, *wine*, *beast*, *inn*, *pence*, *host*, &c., a chimera, a vague speculation of the Jews, derived from heathenish superstition? A parable is sometimes designed simply to state a fact; in order to draw from it some lesson of moral instruction: and in other cases, one fact is stated, and compared with some other fact; but never did the Lord predicate a parable upon any thing that was not *fact*. Neither did the Lord ever present a parable, *wherein* the thing represented, was not at least *equal* to

the representation! Universalists deny this, and say that the representation, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, was ten thousand times as great as the thing it represented. How appropriately does the wise man remark: "The legs of the lame are not *equal*, *so* is a *parable* in the mouth of fools." [Prov. 26. 7.] Let us now examine for a few minutes, the assumption, that the Jews got their idea of a future retribution from the pagans.—We are told that they must have received this doctrine from that source, because it is not revealed in the old testament. We reply, that the heathen believed in the resurrection of the dead; and as the Jews, in the days of the Saviour, believed the same thing, they must therefore have received it from the heathen mythology; for it is not revealed in the Jewish scriptures: and if the heathen believed the truth, with regard to the resurrection, why might they not also be correct, concerning the future judgment? But Universalists will tell us, that the resurrection is taught in the old testament. We say yes: just as plain, and no plainer, and not near as often, as is the doctrine of a future judgment. The Sadducees, however, did not believe in the resurrection, although they believed the old testament. They explained, and figured it away, just as easily as Universalists can the future judgment!

Now since it is admitted by all parties, that the Jews, in the days of Christ, did believe in the doctrine of a hell after death, a future judgment, and a final separation of the righteous from the wicked; we shall not argue at present, from what source they received these doctrines, but will state two incontrovertible facts, which must put this subject forever at rest. 1. Christ never failed, on any occasion, to reprove the Jews of all their *errors*, and to correct every *mistake* they had fallen into. 2. He never reproved them for believing the doctrine of a future general judgment, nor even intimated that this doctrine was a dangerous error, and a delusive heresy! Hence, one of two conclusions must be true: either that Christ believed the doctrine of a future judgement himself, just

as the Jews did; or else he wished them to continue to believe a falsehood; the last of which would be to make him out the basest hypocrite, and most consummate deceiver that ever lived!

Is it not passing strange, that Christ should be a believer in Universalism; and, instead of reproving the Jews for believing the monstrous absurdity of a day of judgment, and future punishment, as Universalists now reprove those who believe these sentiments; he was frequently so careless, as to speak of these very things, and threaten the wicked with punishment in the precise language which the Jews employed, to express their views of this subject; and that, too, without the least intimation that he employed such words, in a sense at all different from the Jews' acceptation of them? Again: The Jews were always very much attached to their traditions, and objected to every doctrine which crossed their track.—Now, is it not singular, that notwithstanding Christ preached Universalism, and with the most indefatigable zeal went against every thing like a general judgment, future punishment, or the existence of a hell after death; still the Jews never urged the first objection against his Universalian sentiments, which if believed would have subverted their whole religion? The only consistent solution of this difficulty is, that the Jews did not understand his peculiarities. And here again it is most singular, that notwithstanding Christ came with the express purpose of inculcating the sublime sentiment of Universalism, and of repudiating the heart-withering dogma of future punishment; and brought into requisition all his wisdom and energy, to prove his positions: still, the most critical lawyers and doctors, who waited continually upon his ministry, with the express purpose of picking a flaw with his doctrine, could not discover but that he believed exactly with them, in relation to future punishment! Now, since Christ believed and preached Universalism, and since Peter says: "He has set us an example that we should walk in his footsteps," it follows *therefore*, that if Universalists preach the doctrine at

all, they should preach it just as Christ did; that is, say nothing about it, or at least, so as not to be understood by the best critics in the land! But as Christ did not, as we can discover, reprove the Jews for their belief in a future general judgment, one of two things must be admitted: either he believed the doctrine himself; or he wished them to believe it, let it be true or false. And as Christ did not preach Universalism so that the lawyers could comprehend him, he must therefore have preached it very obscurely indeed; and one of two things must follow as a matter of course: either he possessed an inferior talent, and had an exceeding poor way of expressing himself, or else he considered it a dangerous doctrine to preach very plainly, and consequently, must have been either sceptical, with regard to its truth, or its utility. And if it was unprofitable then, to preach this doctrine so as to be understood; and unsafe to reprove men for believing in future punishment, it is certainly wisdom in us, to preach the doctrine just as did our Lord, enshrouded in so much mystery and obscurity, that no man on earth would believe such to be our sentiment; and whenever we go to reproving men for believing the cruel dogma of *hell* and *damnation*, we should begin just as Christ did: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the *damnation* of *hell*?" or, as it should be: "How can ye believe in the damnation of hell?"!! But if Universalists should back off the track just here, and contend that the Jews were all Universalists, as well as Christ; still it will not save them from swinging, but will be simply fastening round their neck the other end of the rope! for it presents the sublime aspect, of a whole congregation of Universalists, persecuting their preacher from city to city, until they put him to death; and for nothing in the world, but for simply preaching Universalism, the very doctrine they themselves believed, —the only peaceable doctrine under the sun, which is calculated in its very nature to make all men love the Lord, and love one another, and the only doctrine which, when received into the heart, will forever exclude the

last vestige of the spirit of intolerance and persecution! But we shall now, after this digression, return to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Universalists ask, if wicked men, as soon as they die, enter into misery; what is the use of a day of judgment? We ask in return, if the thief, the robber, or the murderer enters into jail, whenever arrested, where is the propriety of a day of trial, at which time to bring the culprit before the court, to be judged, condemned, sentenced, and committed to the penitentiary during life? Universalists may take the ground, as they most generally do, that such a routine of operations, is beneath the character and dignity of an all-wise God. This objection, however, is but another specimen of their infidelity. The veriest Deist, who dares to raise his puny arm against the Most High, can bring scores of as consistent objections against the bible. He will ask: When God sent down the destroying angel, and slew the first born of Egypt, why did he not slay the rest of them, as he knew he would have to do in a few days? Why did he put the matter off till he got them into the Red Sea, when he could just as easily have killed them at home? If Universalists will reconcile this, with their views of consistency, we will reconcile every objection connected with this parable, upon the same principle precisely.

Let us now see what is the true meaning of this parable, according to Universalism. *Lazarus* represents the Gentile nation, and the rich man represents the Jews; and mark the fact, that these two nations embraced at that time the whole human family. Very good. We shall now read the parable according to this exposition. "There was a certain Jewish nation, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day. And there was a certain Gentile nation named Lazarus, which was laid at the gate of the Jewish nation, full of sores: and desiring to be fed with crumbs, which fell from the Jewish nation's table; moreover the dogs came and licked the Gentile nation's sores. And it came to pass that the Gentile nation died, and was

carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The Jewish nation also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments; and seeth Abraham afar off, and the Gentile nation in his bosom. And the Jewish nation cried and said: Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send the Gentile nation, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said: Son, remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and likewise the Gentile nation his evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. Then the Jewish nation said: I pray thee, therefore, Father, that thou would'st send the Gentile nation to my Father's house; for I have five brethren; that he testify to them, lest they also come to this place of torment!!" Now will Universalists be so good as to tell us, what five nations there were in existence, as brethren to the Jewish nation, after the Jewish and Gentile nations, which embraced the whole human family, had died, and gone into eternity? And after they tell us this, let them also inform us, who was the *Father* of the Jewish nation, to whose house the Gentile nation was requested to go and testify! If it was Abraham, as Universalists admit, where was the propriety of the Jewish nation requesting the Gentile nation to go to his Father's house, when he was there already?!

We shall now give our exposition, and let Universalists beat it if they dare! The rich man represents the Universalist preacher, whilst Lazarus signifies the poor layman,—a member of this preacher's parish. His being full of *sores*, represents the great number of *doubts* and *difficulties* concerning Universalism, with which he was troubled: and by his laying at the rich man's gate, desiring to be fed with crumbs which fell from his table, we are to understand this honest hearted layman, setting at the door of the Universalist tabernacle, feasting upon the manna which falls in showers from between the horns of the altar! "Moreover *dogs* came and licked his *sores*." *This represents* the drunkards, gamblers,

and profane swearers, coming to this doubting layman, and in the midst of oaths, and the perfume of whisky, extolling the boundless extent of divine goodness, and praising the glorious doctrine of Universal salvation, in order to heal up his *difficulties*, and allay his *doubts!*—"And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." By this we understand that the *layman*, being overcome by his *doubts* and *difficulties*, renounced Universalism; and being converted to christianity, he was carried by the instrumentality of the *angels*, that is the true preachers of the gospel, into the *bosom of the christian church!* "The rich man also *died*," that is, the preacher also renounced Universalism, and was *buried*, or *enshrouded*, in the mazes of *scepticism;* and finally "he lifted up his eyes in *hell*," that is in the dark dominions of *Atheism;* "being in torments." By this we discover the wretched, and dolorous condition of him, who has no other prospect before him, than at death to sink into the shades of eternal oblivion. In this situation he beholds Lazarus "*a far off;*" representing the immense distance between *Atheism* and *christianity;* and in Abraham's bosom,—the bosom of the *church*, he was feasting upon the rich prospect of future and endless felicity; when this bewildered and gloomy Atheist, requests his old friend Lazarus, to leave the church of Christ, and come over into the dominions of Atheism, to administer even one drop of consolation;—showing thereby that the last ray of hope had departed from him! But this disconsolate wretch is informed, that there is a broad and impassable *gulf*, between Atheism and the christian church; and this gulf represents the *word of God;* which must forever separate the one from the other! And finally, as his last request, he desires Lazarus to go back to his father's house, that is, the Universalist church; and warn his *five brethren*, who were five other Universalist preachers,—to repent; that is, to leave off preaching Universalism,—"lest they *come* to this place of torment,"—this dark and gloomy *region of fatality*, as it is just as natural for a Universal-

ist, if he acts consistently, and carries out the principles of his doctrine, to become an Atheist, as it is for a wicked man to die and go to hell!! Here then you have our exposition of this parable, and it is as good a fit, and I believe a little better, than any exposition Universalists have ever yet found out!

20. "Wherefore I say unto you: all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." [Math. 12. 31, 32.]

Remarks: This is another exceedingly difficult text for Universalists to dispose of. They have universally, I believe, adopted the exposition, that "*this world*," and "*the world to come*," signify the Jewish and the Christian dispensations: and if this be refuted, then they will acknowledge, if they are honest men, that this text cannot be reconciled with their doctrine, as the above is the only way they have ever yet found out, of evading its force. We shall in the first place, however, admit for the sake of argument, that *this world* and *the world to come* do mean the Jewish and Christian dispensations; and thus give them all they ask, and see if it will help their cause. Then it follows, that those who blasphemed against the Holy Ghost in the days of Christ, are not yet *forgiven;* for the christian dispensation yet continues; and as those characters have been dead and in eternity, for more than 1800 years; it follows, that they have been all this while *sinners;* and as Universalism teaches, that sin and misery always go hand in hand, it demonstrates hence, that for more than 1800 years men have been suffering torment in the world of spirits! We thus prove that Mr. *punishment* is a poor Saviour! If a doctor should practice on a patient 1800 years, and the disease continue *just as* bad, as when he commenced;

you would not only think such a man a poor physician, but you would also conclude, that such medicine would *never* cure the disease, but finally destroy the patient! Again: The christian dispensation will continue as long as Christ remains upon the throne; and he will reign until the *resurrection*, as Paul teaches in the 15th chap. of 1 Cor., and consequently, the blasphemers against the Holy Ghost will remain sinful and miserable, till the "*immortal resurrection*." And as Christ "shall reign, till all his enemies are [destroyed or] put under his feet;" and as wicked men, or those who are in their sins, are enemies to Christ; it follows incontrovertibly, that those blasphemers will not be forgiven until they are *destroyed!* And as the christian dispensation is the dispensation of *pardon;* it follows also, if they are not forgiven in this dispensation, they will not be forgiven in any other;—and as Christ delivers up the *mediatorial* reign, when this dispensation comes to a close; it is established beyond controversy, that the blasphemers against the Holy Ghost, will never be forgiven after that; for no man can be saved from sin, independent of the *mediation* of Christ!! This is meeting Universalism on its own ground, and fighting it with its own sword.

But we shall now prove, that *this world*, and *the world to come*, signify the present and immortal states of existence, and not two dispensations. Let us first see what is the meaning of "*this world*." The apostle declares: "For we brought nothing into *this world*, and it is certain we can carry nothing out." [1 Tim. 6. 7.] That is, we brought nothing into *this state of existence*, (not *this dispensation*) and we shall carry nothing out! The following texts are sufficiently plain without comment:

"Because as he is, so are we in *this world*." [1 John 4. 17.]

"Hearken my beloved brethren: hath not God chosen the poor of *this world*, rich in faith?" [Jam. 2. 5.]

"Charge them that are rich in *this world*, that they be not high minded." [1 Tim. 6. 17.]

"If any man among you seemeth to be wise in *this world*, let him become a fool that he may be wise."—[1 Cor. 3. 18.]

"For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved *this present world*." [2 Tim. 4. 10.]

"We should live soberly, righteously, and godly in *this present world*." [Tit. 2. 12.]

"And he said unto them: ye are from beneath, I am from above, ye are of *this world*, I am not of *this world*." [John 8. 23.]

"And Jesus said: for judgment am I come into *this world*." [John 3. 39.]

"He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hath his life in *this world*, shall keep it unto life eternal." John 12. 25.]

"Jesus answered: My kingdom is not of *this world*." [John 18. 36.]

In each of these examples, the true signification of "this world," is *this state of existence;* and I here assert, fearless of contradiction, that "this world," does not once in the bible signify the *Jewish dispensation!* But we shall now let Universalists themselves, tell us what is the true meaning of *this world*, and its opposite *that world*, or *the world to come*. Turn to Luke 20. 34: "The children of *this world* marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that world* [or *the world to come*]—neither marry nor are given in marriage." The whole fraternity of Universalists admit, and contend that *this world* and *that world* in the above text, refer to the *mortal* and *immortal* states of existence! They would hardly be willing to interpret this passage, the way they do the other: "The children of the *Jewish dispensation* marry and are given in marriage; but they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain the *christian dispensation*, neither marry nor are given in marriage!" (See examination of Math. 22. 29, 30. Chap. 1.) Paul says, that Christ is exalted, "far above all principality, and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world

but also in *that which is to come.*" [Eph. 1. 21.] *This world*, here, cannot mean the Jewish dispensation; for that had come to an end long before the apostle wrote this letter. And *the world to come* in the above text, cannot signify the christian dispensation; for that *had already come*, in the past tense: and was not, as the apostle testifies in another place: "the *world to come* whereof we speak." [Heb. 2. 5.] But it may be said that Paul was not speaking of the future state of existence, in connection with this latter text. I affirm that he was, both immediately before, and immediately after he makes this remark. "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." [Heb. 1. 13.] When this is done, the immortal state of existence, or "the world to come," whereof he was speaking, will commence. In the same chapter he speaks of the destruction of death, and "him that hath the power of death, that is the devil;" and of delivering those, "who through fear of death, are all their lifetime subject to bondage;" and also speaks of "bringing many sons *unto glory.*" [Verses 10, 14, 15.] Can any man read this, with his eyes only half open, and say that Paul was not speaking of the future state of existence? I think hardly.

But Universalists sometimes assert, that, according to our exposition, the Saviour is made to contradict himself: by first stating, that "*all manner* of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men," and then in the next sentence affirming, that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven in time nor in eternity!—Universalists do not notice, however, the conjunction "*but*," which connects these two sentences; or they would evidently see, that there is no contradiction. "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, *but* (that is, except *one*,) the *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*, shall not be forgiven." They might upon the same principle affirm, that God contradicted himself, in giving a law to our first parents: "Of *every tree of the garden* thou mayest freely eat: BUT of the tree *of knowledge* of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it;"

[Gen. 2. 16, 17,] meaning thereby, according to Universalism, that they might eat of that forbidden tree after while; but must not eat of it right off!! Well, says one, be this as it may, Christ does not say that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall *never* be forgiven! I assert that he does. "All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, *hath* NEVER *forgiveness*." [Mark 3. 29.]

Now, Mr. Universalism, how will you dispose of this? Will you say that "*never*," only signifies a little while? Let us see. God says to the man who fears his name: "I will *never* leave thee, nor forsake thee," [Heb. 13. 5,] that is, I will not leave thee nor forsake thee for a little while; but finally I will depart from thee eternally!! If the Universalist acceptation, of this unpardonable sin be correct, then no christian, (much less a sinner,) can have any assurance of salvation from the promises of God. But still worse: the Saviour not only declares, that the man who blasphemes against the Holy Ghost shall *never* be forgiven; but also, that he "is in danger of ETERNAL DAMNATION." Universalists tell us that this "*eternal damnation*," signifies the destruction of Jerusalem! Not so. We have shown, according to Universalism, that those who committed this *blasphemy* in the days of Christ, are not yet forgiven, and will not be, as long as the christian dispensation continues: and as long as men are *unforgiven*, according to the Saviour's language, they are in danger of this *eternal damnation:* and dare Universalists tell us, that those blasphemers are *now* in danger of the destruction of Jerusalem! Not quite! Neither will it do to say, that this *damnation* signifies the condemnation of guilt, which a man receives, as he commits the sin; for *this*, the blasphemer is not in danger of, as he has it already! You could not with any propriety, say to a man, when he was in the water: Sir, you are in danger of falling overboard! Neither could it be said, concerning a man who was already in hell, that he was in danger of going *there! Hence this* damnation is future; as the

Saviour teaches: "He that believeth not *shall be damned*." [Mark 16. 16.] This does not however contradict the text which says: "He that believeth not *is condemned already*;" [Jon. 3. 18,] for the unbeliever not only has the condemnation of guilt, in the present tense; but he *shall be damned* also, in the future! For example: Suppose a man is an unbeliever when he is thirty years old: the Saviour declares that he "*shall be damned*." Suppose he is an unbeliever when he is eighty; yet the Saviour's words remain true: He "*shall be damned*," still in the future: and suppose he is an infidel the very last breath he draws; and he dies, and goes into eternity an unbeliever; as certain as there is truth in the words of Christ, he "*shall be damned*," still in the future, which proves his damnation to be beyond death, in the *eternal* state of existence, and consequently, an *eternal damnation!* This corresponds exactly with the language of the text, under examination: "Is in danger of *eternal damnation*;" and as Universalists admit, that this sin will not be forgiven in the christian dispensation; and as we have shown, (and Universalists admit the same,) that the christian dispensation will continue till the resurrection of the dead; it follows, hence, incontrovertibly, that this *eternal* damnation, of which these blasphemers were in danger, is beyond the *resurrection:* which agrees exactly with Paul, when he speaks of "the *resurrection of the dead*, and of *eternal judgment*," which we have already examined. This "*eternal judgment*," which the apostle declares to be beyond the resurrection, must certainly take place before men can experience an *eternal* condemnation, for the condemnation must be always according to the judgment which condemns! Here, then, we leave this text, and if Universalists can prove that the blasphemers against the Holy Ghost, *will be forgiven*, and that they will not experience an *eternal damnation*, to them be all the praise!

21. "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and

the mighty men, and every bond-man, and every free-man, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the *great day of his wrath* is come, and who shall be able to stand?" [Rev. 6. 15–17.]

Remarks: The only exposition Universalists have ever yet found out for this text; is the destruction of Jerusalem! But this will not do; for there is a scene decribed as taking place, just before this "*great day of his wrath*," in the following language: "And the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." [Verses 12, 13.] These same wonders, which are here placed just *before* this *great day of his wrath*, are placed by the Saviour, not only *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, (proving incontrovertibly, that this event was not "*the great day of his wrath*," spoken of in the above proof-text,) but also, beyond the tribulation of the Jews, in being scattered among the nations of the earth! "Immediately *after* the tribulation of those days, shall the *sun be darkened*, and the *moon shall not give her light*, and the *stars shall fall from heaven*." (See exam. of Math. 24., chap. 2.) Joel predicts the same day, referred to in the Revelations: "I will show wonders in the heavens, and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke; the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, BEFORE the great and terrible day of the Lord come." [Joel 2. 30, 31.]

The reader will bear in mind, that whilst Joel, as well as the Revelator, places the *darkening of the sun* BEFORE "the great day of his wrath," or "the great and *terrible day* of the Lord;" the Saviour places it AFTER the destruction of Jerusalem, and (as we have shown in the preceding chapter,) still in the future to us; which proves that this "great day of his wrath," when the wicked shall call for the rocks and the mountains to fall on them,

and hide them from the face of the *Lamb*, will be at the resurrection of the dead, when the *Lamb* shall appear the second time, to judge the world in righteousness! Universalists sometimes quote Mal. 4. 5. upon this subject, to confine, if possible, this great and terrible day to the destruction of Jerusalem. But neither will this answer their purpose. "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet, *before* the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." This does not say when this "*great and dreadful day*" shall come, it only says that Elijah the prophet (whom we admit to be John the Baptist) shall come *before* that day, which is just as true, putting the day still future, as it would be, if it had reference to the destruction of Jerusalem! But it may be asked: Is it likely that the prophet had reference to so long a period of time, as 1800 years? You will remember, however, that this is the language of God himself; and 1800 years with him would be but a very short space of time, according to the testimony of Peter. I might also ask: Is it likely, that the prophet would refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, which transpired between forty and fifty years from the time John the Baptist made his appearance, which would be considered by us, a long period of time? We could thus, with the consistency of Universalism, infer that "the great and dreadful day of the Lord" could not be so far off, as the destruction of Jerusalem, and hence must mean *the day* when Christ was crucified!

But to return again to the text. The Revelator is speaking of opening the seven seals, and Universalists are compelled to admit, themselves being judges, that this *great day of wrath* is to take place in eternity: for just before the angel commenced opening the seals, John declares that he heard "every creature, which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever;" [Rev. 5. 13.] and be it remembered,

that Universalists quote this very text, and apply it to the resurrection state! Then immediately after, comes this "*great day of his wrath;*" and immediately following this, John sees "a great multitude, which no man could number; *of* all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues," which Universalists (as I have before shown) also apply to the resurrection state! Hence, if the *commencement* and the *conclusion* are in eternity, as Universalists contend, I would like to know how they would work it to get the *middle* in time!

22. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame, and everlasting contempt: and they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." [Dan. 12. 2, 3.]

Remarks: Universalists have three ways of disposing, or trying to dispose of this text. We expect to look them all in the face!

1. It is contended that this language has reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, from the first verse in the chapter: "And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was, since there was a nation, even to that same time." In connection with this, is quoted the language of the Saviour, with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the scattering of the Jews, as we freely admit. "For there shall be great tribulation such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor never shall be." [Math. 24. 41.] Universalists assert, that these two texts are parallel, and refer to the same events. We deny it, and call for proof. But we may wait till doom's day, and no proof in favor of that position can be given! The Pro and Con of Universalism contends, that the tribulation, spoken of in the 24th of Matthew, was *national*, and not individual. (Page 158.) This is true. *Then*, was the greatest *national* tribulation that the history of time records; and as the Saviour here testifies, the greatest calamity of a *national* character

that *shall ever be!* Universalists are continually putting down: "NO, NOR EVER SHALL BE," in large capitals; just as though it were in their favor. But will they be so good as to inform us, what they mean by the word "*ever?*" You don't mean *eternally*, gentlemen, do you? No; for then those who went "into *ever*-lasting punishment," would hardly get out in time for your universal salvation! You mean simply a limited duration. Very good; then we can understand the text: "For there shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor shall not be for a limited duration of time!!" This would rather go to favor the idea, that there would be a greater tribulation, after that *limited duration* came to an end!

But Daniel speaks of an individual tribulation,—the greatest that ever was, or that ever would be, which was vividly portrayed by the Revelator, in the last text examined; when men should "call for the rocks and mountains to fall on them, and hide them from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the *wrath of the Lamb.*"

2. The next effort at evasion, is upon the phrase: "*Many of them.*" This, however, is but a recent quibble, and it is used to pretty good advantage, by those who understand it.

They contend that this text cannot refer to the general resurrection, from the fact that "*many of them,*" does not signify *all of them*, which would certainly be the case, if it had reference to the general resurrection. They ask the question: "Suppose I should say: *Many of them* that were in the house, came out; would it not follow conclusively, that some that were in, did not come out?" I answer yes. Then how can you make the text in Daniel refer to the general resurrection? I will show you. Some that were sleeping in the dust of the earth, when Daniel penned this prediction, arose from the dead at the resurrection of Christ. "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which *slept*, arose, *and came* out of the graves, after his resurrection, and

went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."—[Math. 27. 52, 53.] Now who would suppose that those saints *again died*, and went back into their graves? I do not; for "it is appointed unto men *once* to die," and that would be dying *twice!* The only reasonable, and consistent view of the subject is, that those saints went with Christ, when he ascended to heaven; and he shall again return with them; for he "shall *so come*, in *like manner*;" and we have the most positive testimony, that he shall come "with *ten thousand of his saints*." [Jude 15.] This being true: Daniel could with all propriety declare; "*many of them* that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, [at the general resurrection,—not *all of them*, for some are to awake before that time, at the resurrection of Christ: but all that remain, will come forth, at the resurrection of the just, and of the unjust,] some to everlasting life, and some to *shame* and *everlasting contempt*."

3. The last objection is predicated upon verse 7.—"When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished."—But this kills Universalism dead, as far as this text is concerned. In the first place, the Jews were not scattered, till after Jerusalem was destroyed; and hence, this *resurrection*, which was to take place *after* the scattering of the Jews was accomplished, must also be after the destruction of Jerusalem, which condemns Universalism out of its own mouth! But in the second place: this very text places the matter still in the future. Is the scattering of the Jews yet *accomplished?* Not yet; neither will it be, until they cease to be scattered, and are gathered back to their own land. Hence, by the argument brought to sustain the opposite, we have proved the resurrection of Dan. 12. 2. to be yet future! But there is one other argument upon this subject, which corroborates the above position, and shows that I have not at all misunderstood the prophet. Universalists themselves do not contend for a literal resurrection, at the downfall of Jerusalem, nor at any subsequent period, till

the present time; and hence, they are compelled to admit, that this resurrection is still future; for the last verse proves it to be *literal*. The angel says to Daniel: "But go thou thy way, till the end be, for *thou shalt rest*, AND STAND IN THY LOT *at the end of the days!*" [Verse 13.] Thus, Daniel himself, is to have part in this resurrection, of which he speaks! This is something, I reckon, Universalists have never thought of. If they have, they have been exceedingly cautious to keep it to themselves!

23. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." [John 5. 28, 29.]

Remarks: This text would need no remarks, were it not that the pestilential, and withering hand of sophistry has been laid upon it, until in the minds of many, its true force has become obscured. Here, as in other cases, Universalists raise a tremendous hue and cry about *figure! figure! figure!* But suppose the text had happened to read a little differently: "All that are in the graves, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done *evil* to the resurrection of life, as well as those that have done good;" then it would be *literal* of course: yes verily, every word of it: no mistake about it;—the same resurrection precisely, of which Paul speaks in the 15th of 1st Cor. But why would it be literal then, my dear sir, any more than it is now? O because, if it be taken literal the way it is now, it would condemn our doctrine eternally, and we could not help ourselves; and hence it must certainly be figurative:—but if it read the other way, it would then have to be understood literally without doubt; for it would thus prove our doctrine true, and every thing in the bible, that appears to squint in favor of *our* doctrine, you know *must be literal* of course, let the circumstances be what *they may*!! This reveals the true secret of the whole

matter, and if Universalists would unbosom their hearts upon this subject, they would confess it!

It is known to all men, that every text which can be construed so as to appear, in the least degree, to favor Universalism if taken literally, must be understood in this sense: but when they happen to light upon one of those numerous texts of scripture, which most pointedly, and unequivocally teach a future retribution, and a day of judgment beyond the resurrection; it is immediately converted into a beautiful cluster of Eastern metaphors, —the *devil*, a figure of speech,—and *hell*, a bug-bear of heathen mythology, and Jewish superstition! Upon this principle could they dispose of the whole bible; and it would have been utterly impossible for Christ to have taught the doctrine of future and eternal punishment, had he believed it ever so much, and had he brought into requisition infinite wisdom to inculcate the doctrine; and even had he exhausted the vocabulary of heaven, and the encyclopedia of man, in order to muster language and terms, of sufficient force, to express the sentiment: still it could all be set aside at a single sweep, by one of our modern, intellectual giants:—let him but once pass his magic wand across the book, and *figure of figures, says the preacher, all is figure!!!* Neither is this all. When they once get it converted into a figure; they then assume an unbounded license, of making it a figure of any thing they can think of, so it does not cross the track of Universalism! Like the lump of clay in the hands of the potter,—he can shape it to his own liking; —so is a text of scripture in the hands of these spiritual potters:—when completely ground in the mill of bigotry,—and moistened with vain philosophy; it is then dashed upon the wheel of sophistry, and turned into as many rhetorical figures as there are spokes in a wagon wheel! They disregard all rules of interpretation except one, and that is: Universalism must be sustained at all hazards, let come what will; if the bible has to be cut up into inch pieces to do it!

How, I would like to know, would Universalists under-

take to write out the above proof-text, so as to express the orthodox faith? They could not do it to save their souls; for if it can be disposed of, as it now is, no man on earth can word it, so as to stand the ordeal of Universalism. We are told that this text relates to the destruction of Jerusalem, and that *resurrection* signifies *conversion*. But it is a little strange that men should come forth from their graves of sin, or be converted to *damnation:* and it is also a little mysterious, that others who were raised to life, had *done good* in their graves of sin! But Universalism can account for all mysteries, by that most notorious and accommodating science:—*figurology!* As the text is all figurative, let us read it in this way. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their figurative graves, shall hear the figurative voice of the figurative Son of God, and shall figuratively come forth; they that have done good, to the figurative resurrection of figurative life; and they that have done evil, to the figurative resurrection of figurative damnation!" This gives us figures in abundance!

But I deny that the resurrection here is conversion. The Corinthians, to whom Paul wrote, believed in conversion, yet the apostle asks: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead; how say some among you, that there is *no* resurrection of the dead!" [1 Cor. 15. 12.] Hence, conversion is *no* resurrection! But it is said by the great Pro and Con, that it cannot be understood literally, from the fact that all men have done good as well as evil; and hence, every man would be raised both to *life* and *damnation!* [Page 222.] Very shrewd and cunning this, indeed! But the Pro and Con, never once thought, that it involved him in the same difficulty precisely, that it did us! Their coming forth at the destruction of Jerusalem from their "graves of superstition and ignorance," presents just as much of an absurdity, and would be *life* and *damnation both*, to each individual, just as much as though it referred to the general resurrection; and yet our purblind Pro and Con could not see

it! The Lord has, however, taught Universalists a lesson in the prophet Ezekiel, which would forever shut their mouths about all such objections, if they would only put themselves to the trouble of learning it. "When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, ALL *his righteousness* SHALL NOT BE REMEMBERED; but for his iniquity that he hath commited, he shall die for it. Again, when I shall say unto the wicked: thou shalt surely die: if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right,—he shall surely live; he shall not die. NONE OF HIS SINS—SHALL BE MENTIONED UNTO HIM: he hath *done that which is lawful and right;* he shall surely live." [Ezek. 33. 13–16.] This is as plain as though the Lord had designed it especially to answer this objection. Suppose a man has lived a righteous life, till he is forty years old, and after this practices iniquity for one year, and then dies in his sins;—this man will come forth "to the *resurrection of damnation.*" But did not the man do *good?* Yes: but Jehovah himself decides, that "*all his righteousness* shall not be remembered;" hence it is forgotten, and the same precisely as though it had never been performed! Again: suppose another case; a man lives till he is forty years old in the practice of wickedness: he then turns from his sins, and does that which is lawful and right,—God forgives him, and he falls asleep in Jesus. Such an one will come forth "to the *resurrection of life.*" But, say you, this man *did evil* forty years! But stop: the Lord declares, that "*none of his sins shall be mentioned unto him*, he hath done [GOOD,] *that which is lawful and right*, he shall surely *live*,"—he shall surely come forth to the resurrection of *life!* Here then we have this objection fairly met, and disposed of; and a number of other objections, of a similar character, are answered by the same argument.

But I am asked: What is to be done with infants, if this refers to the general resurrection? They have done neither *good* nor *evil!* As I am only part of a yankee, I shall have to answer this question by asking two others! 1.

What is to be done with infants in the general resurrection, according to the testimony of Paul? for he refers to that event, as Universalists admit, when he speaks of the "resurrection of the dead, both of the *just* and of the *unjust*," and infants are never spoken of in the scriptures under either of these two heads! 2. What is to be done with infants, according to 1 Cor. 15. 23? for they are not *men*, and the apostle, speaking of the general resurrection, says: "Every *man* in his own order?" And we might also ask these erudite expositors, what will be done with *women*? The fact of Christ and his apostles, in speaking of the general resurrection, not mentioning infants, is no reason why they were not included: neither is the fact of their not being mentioned, any reason in such cases, that the general resurrection was not referred to. It was an admitted fact on all hands, that those who died in infancy, were safe; and that their resurrection would be to the enjoyment of eternal life. Hence, neither Christ, nor his apostles, as a general thing, discussed that subject. Had they been endeavoring to teach that the wicked would be raised holy and happy, they would no doubt have frequently talked of the resurrection of infants, by way of comparison. Their object, as we have seen, in all their teachings, was to inculcate the doctrine, that men would be raised according to the characters they formed in this life; and this they urged as a motive to obedience. Hence the propriety of not bringing infants into the question. But if all this will not satisfy Universalists concerning this objection; we have one thing more that will. We read in the 25th of Matthew, that when Christ shall come in the glory of his Father, he shall separate the *righteous* from the *wicked!* This says nothing about infants, for they are neither *righteous* nor *wicked:* and more than that, all on one hand, had fed the hungry, and clothed the naked; whilst those on the other, had neglected it to their condemnation, neither of which can be said concerning infants. But ah, say you, this refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, *and signifies* the separation of the righteous disciples from

the wicked Jews! Well, suppose we should admit it, (which we do not,) still it does not help the matter; for there were infants at that siege, both with the righteous disciples and the wicked Jews: and thus we see, according to your own logic, that infants may be involved in a matter of a general character, whilst none are mentioned except those who have done either *good* or *evil!* Again, it is said that the word "*graves*," is to be understood figuratively; and as a parallel, they quote Ezek. 37. 12, 13. "Therefore prophesy and say unto them, thus saith the Lord God: behold O my people, I will open *your graves*, and bring you into the land of Israel, and ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened *your graves*, O my people, and brought you up out of *your graves*." But this does nothing for the cause of Universalism. The cases are not parallel, neither is the language. In Ezekiel it is "*your graves*," in the possessive case, four times in succession; but in John it is "*the graves*," which I affirm is never once used figuratively, in the whole bible! This phrase occurs eight times, and in every instance, it signifies the literal habitation of the dead! I shall quote one text as a sample of all the rest. "Behold the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and *the graves* were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose, and came out of *the graves*, [not *their graves*,] after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." [Math. 27. 51–53.]—This demonstrates the meaning of "*the graves*" to be literal. Universalists sometimes take advantage of the ignorant, (or else their own ignorance takes advantage of them,) by asserting that the word rendered *graves*, in John 5. 28, is not the same in the Greek, as commonly signifies the literal habitation of the dead. Such was the ground taken by Mr. Flanders. But any one, with the slightest knowledge of the Greek language, can expose its fallacy. The word is *nemeion*, and the same, I affirm, that is generally employed in the New Testament, to express the literal habitation of the dead! A

few examples shall be given. "Jesus therefore again, groaning in himself, cometh to the (*nemeion*) *grave:* it was a *cave*, and a stone lay upon it." [John 11. 38.]—"And when he was come to the other side, into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two, possessed with devils, coming out of the (*nemeion*) *tomb*." [Math. 8. 28.] "And he brought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a (*nemeion*) *sepulchre*, which was hewn out of a rock." [Mark 15. 46.] "Wo unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites; because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the (*nemeia*) *sepulchres* of the righteous." [Math. 23. 29.] So much for that objection. But the circumstances of the case, and the context, prove that the Saviour designed being understood literally. In this connection he introduces three different things, which follow each other in regular succession; beginning at the least, and ending with the greatest.

Reader, you will see the force of this, if you reflect, that Christ is about to give them the strongest reasons in his possession, to induce the people to believe on him as the Messiah. We shall examine these items in order.

1. "Verily, verily, I say unto you: he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, *hath everlasting life*, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto *life*." [Verse 24.] Let us stop here a minute, and see what the Saviour designed to teach.—Universalists tell us that he spake of the conversion of sinners to christianity. We say so too. Again they tell us, that "*everlasting life*" signifies the present enjoyment of the christian, and does not refer to the future state. *We* say that it *does not* mean the present enjoyment of the christian; and that in every instance, where it occurs in the New Testament, it has reference to the *immortal state* of existence! Do you understand that!! Yes, say you, but I do not believe it; for how could Christ say, that the believer *hath* everlasting life? and *is passed* from death unto *life*, if it has reference to the *future state*? This is a fair question, and shall be as

rly answered! What says the apostle John? "He at *hath* the Son, *hath* life." [1 Jo. 5. 12.] According , this the believer *hath* the Son, just as he *hath* life.— t us now inquire how he *hath* the Son? Not in *per-* n, or in *fact*, surely; for in this sense he is only in the alms of glory above! But the apostle Paul decides the int: "That *Christ* may dwell *in your hearts* BY FAITH." ph. 3. 17.] "Which is *Christ in you* the HOPE *of glo-* ." [Col. 1. 27.] Thus it is, that the believer *hath* the n, by FAITH and HOPE, and not in *fact:* and thus it is at the believer HATH *everlasting life*, or *is passed* from ath *unto life;* not in *fact*, but by FAITH and HOPE!— his one argument levels Universalism to the dust, and advocates will feel the loss they have sustained, by ing thus driven from their most successful hiding place! is known to all, that whenever one of those numerous ts are quoted, which declare *eternal* or *everlasting* e to be *conditional*, Universalists are eternally dodging hind this text in the 5th of John. But as they are w routed from that retreat, they stand exposed in open ld, with the artillery of *forty* texts of scripture level- l against them, which most pointedly teach that *eter- l* and *everlasting life* depends upon the character and nduct of men in this present state of being! This rtainly is disposing of Universalism by the wholesale! 2. But let us now see what is the next greatest thing, e Saviour introduces, after the conversion of sinners to ristianity. "Verily, verily, I say unto you: the hour coming, and now is, when the *dead* shall hear the voice the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." [Verse .] The hour had already come, when some who were *ad*, heard the voice of Christ and lived. Thus we read: and he came and touched the bier; and they that bare n stood still. And he said: young man I say unto ee, arise! and he that was *dead*, sat up, and began to eak." [Luke 7. 14, 15.] This was a greater work than a man to believe on Christ. 3. But now for the eatest of all. "Marvel not at this: [be not astonished either of those works which I have named; for

I am now going to tell you something that I will do, which is far greater than the conversion of a sinner, or bringing a dead man to life!] for the hour is coming, in the which ALL THAT ARE IN THE GRAVES shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Had a Universalist been there, he would have said, astonishing! that is the very thing you told us a while ago!! "Yes, verily, verily, instead of the Lord telling them any thing new, he was telling them exactly the same thing over and over! "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that the hour is coming when sinners shall be converted!" But I will tell you something greater than this. Well, what is it? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming when sinners shall be converted!!" But I will tell you something far greater still. What: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that the hour is coming in the which a whole lot of sinners shall be converted!!!" This is positively the very doctrine Universalism makes Christ to teach!

But finally, upon this subject we remark: that the word *resurrection*, which occurs twice in this text, is not once used figuratively in the whole bible! It occurs in *thirty-eight* instances, and out of that number *thirty-seven* can have no other than a literal acceptation: and is it at all likely, that this individual case, is to be understood in a figurative sense, and that too, for no other reason than because it annihilates Universalism, if taken literally! Now since Universalists admit that this word is to be understood literally, in nearly every text where it occurs, they are not going to have the privilege of making it figurative in this single case, unless they give us better evidence than their own dogmatical ipsi-dixit. Let them adduce an example where the word *resurrection* is used in an acknowledged figurative sense, or they need never expect to make any reflecting mind believe that this solitary text is an exception to the whole bible!!—Every objection is now fairly met; and here it stands unscathed, in all its invulnerable and invincible strength: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good to the *resurrection*

of life; and they that have *done evil* to the *resurrection of damnation.*" ☞ Let this be disposed of, if it can!!

24. "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in *the last day.*" [John 12. 48.]

Remarks: This is too plain to need comment. It tells exactly when the day of judgment shall take place;—"the *last* day!" But it may be asked: when is "the *last day?*" Universalists themselves shall answer, by giving us one of their strongest proof-texts: "This is the Father's will that hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at *the last day.*" [John 6. 39.] This text Universalists apply to the resurrection; and we will give them credit for being right *once.* Not only do they admit, that "*the last day*" is to be the day of the *resurrection;* but we have the same admission from a great deal higher source! "Jesus saith unto her: thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him: I know that he shall rise again, in the RESURRECTION at the LAST DAY." [John 11. 23, 24.] How plain, how positive, and how unambiguous is the testimony of the bible in favor of the day of judgment, at the resurrection of the dead? It being expressed in so many places, and in so many, yet unequivocal ways, one would think the man almost insane, who would call the doctrine in question!

25. THE SOUNDING OF THE SEVENTH, OR LAST TRUMPET!

Remarks: This argument, which is contained in the tenth and eleventh chapters of Revelations, is one of great importance, and shall close the present chapter. In Rev. 10. 6. the angel who was to sound the seventh, or last trump, takes his stand, lifts his hand to heaven, and swears by him that liveth forever and ever, "that there should be *time no longer.*" This is the first matter of importance, which is to occur at the sounding of the

seventh trump: and Universalists will hardly assert, that this event has yet transpired. Again: "But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the *mystery of God should be finished*, as he hath declared to his servants *the prophets*." [Verse 7.] Thus, we are informed, that the prophesies are to be fulfilled, when the seventh trumpet shall sound; or the mystery of God, which he hath declared to the prophets, shall be finished! This, Universalists admit to be still future: for they contend that the prophets predicted a universal salvation; and they certainly cannot think, that such predictions are yet fulfilled! Hence we are still agreed, that the sounding of the last trump is yet future. Again: "And the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven, saying the kingdoms of this world, *are become the kingdoms of our Lord*, and of his Christ." [Ib. 11. 15.] Here too Universalists will agree with us, that this will not take place, till Christ subdues all things unto himself, which will be at the resurrection. Again, they continue: "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast *taken to thee thy great power*, and hast reigned." This cannot be, as Universalists admit, until Christ delivers up the kingdom to God the Father, which Paul declares to be at the resurrection of the dead! In the next verse we read: "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and *the time of the dead that they should be* JUDGED." But this is not all: "And that thou shouldest *give reward to thy servants the prophets*, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name small and great;" which cannot be done till the prophets are *raised from the dead!* Neither is this all: "And [that thou] shouldst *destroy them that corrupt the earth*." These events are all to take place at the sounding of the last trump: and we not only have the most indubitable evidence, from the items here enumerated, that they all relate to the resurrection of the dead; but the apostle Paul does most positively declare, that "the dead shall be raised" at the sound of the "*last trump*," [1 Cor. 15. 52,] proving in

controvertibly, that *then*, and *there*, the *dead* shall be *judged:* that *then* and *there*, the ancient *prophets*, as well as the saints of all ages, and those that fear the name of God, both small and great *shall be rewarded;* and that *then* and *there* the wicked who have *corrupted* the earth, shall be *destroyed*, and banished into everlasting darkness, from the presence of God, and the glory of his power!

"The *trumpet*, the *trumpet*, the dead have all heard;
Lo! the depths of the stone-covered charnals are stir'd:
From the sea, from the earth, from the south, from the north,
All the vast generations of man are come forth.

The judgment, the judgment, the thrones are all set;
Where the Lamb, and the bright crowned elders are met:
Where all flesh, is at once in the sight of the Lord;
And the doom of eternity, hangs on his word.

O mercy, O mercy, look down from above,
Great Creator, on us, thy dear children of love:
When beneath, to their darkness, the wicked are driven,
May our justified souls find a welcome in heaven!"

CHAPTER IV.

TWENTY-FIVE DISTINCT ARGUMENTS, IN PROOF OF THE CONDITIONALITY OF THE FUTURE LIFE!

"LET ME DIE THE DEATH OF THE RIGHTEOUS, AND LET MY LAST END BE LIKE HIS."—Num. 23. 10.

1. "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give all diligence, to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly, into the *everlasting kingdom* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." [2 Pet. 1. 10, 11.]

Remarks: Universalists try to evade this text, by contending that this "everlasting kingdom," signifies the *kingdom of grace* here on earth. But this cannot be the case, for this substantial reason: those brethren, addressed by the apostle Peter, were already in the kingdom of grace, and in the enjoyment of the present salvation from sin! If this can be proved, then, "the everlasting kingdom" is demonstrated to be the kingdom of glory! Now for the proof. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth:—being born again." [1 Pet. 1. 22, 23.] "Ye also as lively stones *are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood*;—but ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him,

who *hath called* you *out of darkness, into his marvelous light:* which in time past were not a people, but *now are the people of God;* which had not obtained mercy, but now *have obtained mercy.*" [Ib. 2. 5, 9, 10.] "For ye were as sheep going astray, but are *now returned* to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." [Ib. 25.] And in the same chapter, from which this proof-text is taken, the apostle gives them to understand, that they "had been *purged* from their old sins." (Verse 9.)

From this testimony, it is manifest that those brethren, having been *purified, purged* from their old sins,—and called out of darkness into his marvellous light, were then already in the kingdom of grace, and it is just as manifest, that the *everlasting kingdom* of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, into which they had to enter by doing "these things," was the kingdom of celestial glory! But it may be objected, that Christ is to deliver up the kingdom to God the Father. But this is not to be done until after the resurrection, and until after the saints are admitted into it: then the kingdom, with all its glorified citizens, will be delivered up to the Father, when the Son shall exclaim: "Behold here am I, and the children which God hath given me." (Heb. 2. 13.) This argument cannot be set aside!

2. "To him that *overcometh* will I give to eat of the *tree of life*, that is in the midst of the *paradise of God.*" (Rev. 2. 7.)

Remarks: This *paradise of God* cannot refer to any thing less than the upper world: for Paul speaking of visions and revelations, says: "I knew a man in Christ, about fourteen years ago; whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth: such an one, caught up to the *third heaven,—into paradise.*" [2 Cor. 12. 2, 3.] Before Universalists can evade the force of this argument, they must produce positive proof that PARADISE, and the third heaven, are here, in this *world!*

3. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord.—We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord: wherefore we LABOR, that WHETHER PRESENT, OR ABSENT we may be ACCEPTED OF HIM."—[2 Cor. 5. 6, 8, 9.]

Remarks: From this text we discover, that the apostle considered it necessary to LABOR, in order to be accepted of Christ; whether present in the body, or absent from it. This being present with Christ and being absent from the body, the apostle decides in another place, to be the separation of the soul from the body of FLESH, at death. "Christ shall be magnified in my BODY whether it be by LIFE OR DEATH: for to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain;—for I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to DEPART and to BE WITH CHRIST, which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the FLESH, is more needful for you." (Ph. 1. 20–24.) If this does not prove, that men must LABOR in this life, in order to be *accepted* of Christ, when death separates the spirit from the body, then, I know not the meaning of language!

4. "IF SO BE that we SUFFER WITH HIM, we shall also be GLORIFIED TOGETHER." (Rom. 8. 17.) "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, WORKETH FOR US a far more exceeding, and *eternal weight of glory.*" [2 Cor. 4. 17.]

Remarks: These texts teach positively, that suffering persecution for the sake of Christ was necessary, in order to be *glorified with him*, and enjoy that far more exceeding and *eternal weight of glory!* This cannot be confined to this world; for Christ was not glorified till he ascended to the right hand of God. We read concerning him, whilst here on earth: "The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet *glorified.*" [*John* 7. 39.] And as the Holy Ghost was poured out *on the day* of pentecost, when Christ was coroneted *king in Zion*; it follows, that then was he glorified; as

Peter testified in the next discourse: "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; the God of our fathers hath *glorified* his Son Jesus." [Acts 3. 13.] From this it is established, that Christ was *glorified* in heaven; and our glorification *with him*, which the apostle declares to be conditional, must incontrovertibly refer to the immortal state, when the dead saints shall "BE RAISED IN GLORY!"

5. "They returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and to Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith; and that we must through much *tribulation*, enter into the *kingdom of God*." [Acts 14. 22.]

Remarks: The *kingdom of God* here referred to, cannot mean the kingdom of grace here on earth; for those *disciples* who were "in the faith," were, as a matter of course, then in the present kingdom of grace. But we read in Revelations, concerning that innumerable multitude, (which Universalists admit to be in heaven, as I have proved in another place,) "These are they which came out of *great tribulation*, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." [Rev. 7. 14.] Thus: in taking the Universalist application of this text, it proves that the *kingdom of God*, into which the disciples were to enter through *much tribulation*, is the kingdom of ultimate glory! We have a number of other texts, confirming this position. Paul, although in the present kingdom of grace, expresses himself thus: "The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me *unto his heavenly kingdom*;" [2 Tim. 4. 18,] and he also informs the saints of Thessalonica, that if they endured their persecutions with patience, they would "be *counted worthy* of the kingdom of God," for which they suffered. [2 Thess. 1. 5.] The unprejudiced must discover, from this testimony, not only that there is a KINGDOM OF GOD, beyond this life; but also, that an entrance into it, depends upon *our faithfulness here in time*!

6. "Rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your *reward in heaven.*" [Math. 5. 12.]

Remarks: Universalists contend, that the righteous, as well as the wicked, get a full reward for all their actions, in this life. But the Saviour informs us, that those who suffer persecutions for his sake, shall be rewarded in HEAVEN, as they fail of receiving any thing like an adequate reward here in the present state of being. The only way Universalists have ever attempted to get over this testimony, is by denying that HEAVEN refers to the realms of glory. But I here state, once for all, that the word HEAVEN has no other meaning in the New Testament than the world of celestial bliss. Let them convict me of error if they can. If we wish to know the Saviour's meaning of the word HEAVEN, we should examine his use of that word, in the same connection,—the sermon on the mount: "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in HEAVEN." (Verse 16.) "But I say unto you, swear not at all, neither by HEAVEN, for it is God's THRONE, nor by the EARTH, for it is his footstool." (Ib. 34.) "Our Father who art in HEAVEN, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come, thy will be done in EARTH as it is in HEAVEN." (Math. 6. 9, 10.) These examples show the meaning of the word HEAVEN, to be the glorious presence of God. And as certain as the Saviour's words are true, the wicked will never rise to that blissful station!

7. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for GLORY, and HONOR, and IMMORTALITY,—ETERNAL LIFE." (Rom. 2. 6, 7.)

Remarks: This text of itself, is a complete refutation of Universalism. GLORY, HONOR, and IMMORTALITY, are conditional, as the apostle here declares; and are *suspended* upon a *patient continuance in well doing.*—*These exalted blessings are not to be enjoyed in this life, but belong to the future state, as we can demon-*

strate from several considerations. 1. Those brethren, whom the apostle addressed, were then in the full enjoyment of the loftiest blessings and privileges, of a spiritual character, that human beings can enjoy in this mortal state: and yet they were *seeking* for *glory*, and *honor*, and *immortality!* No consistent man will *seek* for that which he already *has*. Hence this GLORY, HONOR, and IMMORTALITY cannot signify any blessing to be enjoyed in this life! 2. Paul testifies in 1. Cor. 15th chap. that these distinguished blessings, belong to the RESURRECTION STATE, and are not to be enjoyed this side of the grave. Let this be remembered! 3. D. Skinner, in his debate with A. Campbell, letter 17, paragraph 21, asserts: that *aphtharsia*, the word rendered *immortality* in the above text, signifies endless bliss, and is never used in a limited sense, or applied to a finite object. Universalists are bound to admit this testimony, as D. Skinner was their champion in that discussion. But we have even a greater commentator than D. Skinner, testifying that this glory, honor and immortality, for which christians are to *seek*, are not to be enjoyed in this lower world. "If ye be risen with Christ, *seek* those things *which are ABOVE where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.* Set your affections on things ABOVE and not on things on the EARTH." (Col. 3. 1, 2.) This settles the point, that immortality, as well as glory and honor, is in the eternal world; and consequently the "INDIGNATION, and WRATH, TRIBULATION, and ANGUISH," (verses 8, 9,) placed in antithesis to them, are also to be awarded in the future state!

8. "For ye had compassion on me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves, that ye have IN HEAVEN a better and an enduring SUBSTANCE: cast not away THEREFORE your confidence, which hath great RECOMPENCE OF REWARD." (Heb. 10. 34, 35.)

Remarks: This "recompence of reward," or this "better and enduring substance," is here declared positively

to be "IN HEAVEN;" and none will obtain it till the resurrection; for the Lord declares: "Thou shalt be RECOMPENSED at the resurrection of the JUST." [Luke 14. 14.]

9. "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, write: Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them."—[Rev. 14. 13.]

Remarks: Universalists have never, as far as I know, given this text any other signification than the literal death of the saints. The Pro and Con, on page 345, was compelled to admit this to be its meaning! Hence it cannot be construed, with the least shade of plausibility, so as to agree with their theory. For the fact being thus emphatically stated, that those who *die in the Lord* are *blessed*, proves just as emphatically that those who die out of the Lord, or die in their sins, are *cursed!* The fact of those, who die in the Lord, *resting* from their labor proves the opposite: that those who die out of the Lord, will be among the number who "shall have no *rest*, day nor night." And as the Pro and Con, was compelled to admit that the works of men *follow* them into eternity, it is established incontrovertibly, that the righteous will be rewarded in eternity for their works in this life; whilst it is just as evident, that the wicked will be rewarded for their wicked deeds, in the future world, which the scriptures most distinctly affirm to be, "an *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord!"

10. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand: I have fought a good fight: I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give unto me in that day; and not to me only, but unto all *them* also that love his appearing." [2. Tim 4. 6–8.]

Remarks: In this text the apostle speaks of the crown

of righteousness, held in reversion for himself, as a reward for running the christian race faithfully; and this was not to be conferred in this life, for he was then ready to be offered, and declares that he had *finished* his course. But the apostle points out a certain *day*, at which time not only he, but also all the faithful shall receive a crown of righteousness, which proves that day to be still in the future, as there are many righteous men now, who have never yet received that crown! And as we have demonstrated in a preceding chapter, that the appearing of Christ will be at the resurrection; and as Paul points out *that*, as the day when he should receive his crown; it follows conclusively, that the crown of glory beyond the resurrection, is suspended upon the condition of holding out faithful to the end.

11. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon *earth*,—but lay up for yourselves treasures in *heaven*." [Math. 6. 19, 20.] "Sell that ye have and give alms, provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth." [Luke 12. 33.] "Jesus said unto him: if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." [Math. 19. 21.]

Remarks: These texts unequivocally teach, that heaven is conditional, and a treasure in that blissful world, depends upon our conduct in this life. We also have it clearly demonstrated, that *heaven* cannot mean any state or relation here on earth, as it is spoken of in contrast with the earth:—and more than this, we have it emphatically stated, that to this exalted state of felicity, "*no thief approacheth.*"

12. "*Follow peace* with all men, and *holiness*, without which no man shall *see the Lord.*" [Heb. 12. 14.]

Remarks: This text is never quoted correctly by Universalists. You will find it in their books, almost [illegible]

versally, thus: "Without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." Quoted in this manner they have no hestitancy in admitting it; as they teach, that all men will be made holy in the operation of the resurrection. But when correctly quoted, it gives the wicked no cloak for their sins. "*Follow peace* with all men, and *holiness*, without *which* [i. e. without *following* peace and holiness:—the relative *which*, referring to the preceding sentence, as its antecedent,] no man shall see the Lord." This puts a different face upon the subject entirely: and instead of teaching what Universalists quote it to prove, it affirms in the most positive manner, that without *following peace and holiness*, no man shall *see* the Lord; or *enjoy* the Lord, as is frequently the meaning of the word "*see*:" For example: "What a man *seeth*, why doth he yet hope for?" [Rom. 8. 24.] This signifies, as all will admit: "What a man *enjoys*, why doth he yet hope for."

13. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the *tree of life*, and may enter in through the gates *into the city*." [Rev. 22. 14.]

Remarks: I have shewn in another part of this book, that Universalists are compelled to admit, as many of them have already done, that this *city* refers to the resurrection state. (See exam. of Rev. 21. 3, 4. chap. 1.) This proves that keeping the commandments is essential to our happiness in the future life. We have also proved in this chapter, that the "*tree of life*" does not belong to this state of existence, but to the "paradise of God,"—the immortal world, which proves unanswerably that the bliss of heaven is conditional!

14. "Every man that striveth for the mastery, is temperate in all things; now they do it to obtain a *corruptible* crown, but we an *incorruptible*." [1 Cor. 9. 25.]

Remarks: Here again we have striving in the holy war, and running in the christian race, in order to ob-

lain an INCORRUPTIBLE crown; and the apostle says: "*So run* that you may *obtain*," showing plainly, that this crown of *incorruptibility* may be *lost*, by pursuing an improper course in running, or by not striving *lawfully!* The Greek word *aphthartos*, from which we have in the common version, the word *incorruptible*, is also acknowledged by D. Skinner to be *endless* in its signification, and that it is never once in the New Testament applied to any thing of a limited character! (Campbell and Skinner; let. 17, par. 21.) The reader will remember, that Universalists are the very men who contend that *incorruptibility* belongs to the resurrection state, and cannot be enjoyed until "the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*, and we shall be changed." (1 Cor. 15. 51.)

15. "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the *salvation* which is in Christ Jesus, with *eternal glory*." (2 Tim. 2. 10.)

Remarks: This text proves that Paul did not believe the theory of Universalism; for he considered it necessary to endure all manner of hardships, in proclaiming the gospel, that the *elect*, (who, of course, were already in the enjoyment of the present salvation from sin,) might obtain a higher salvation, and be crowned with "*eternal glory*." How perverted must be that man's understanding, who can believe Universalism, in the face of such unambiguous testimony as this!

16. "And if children, then *heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Jesus Christ*." (Rom. 8. 17.)—"Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person as Esau, who for one morsel of meat *sold* his *birthright*." (Heb. 12. 16.)

Remarks: "All the joys of *heaven*, and of the *eternal world*, belong to Jesus Christ; and a man, when he becomes a *joint heir* with Christ, receives a right to eternal felicity, which he did not possess before this relation of *joint heirship* existed! And as heirship with Christ,

according to the above text, depends upon becoming *children* of God *by faith*, it follows hence, that no man can have a right to the blessings of the future state, until he voluntarily becomes an heir of God, and a joint heir with Jesus Christ! Remember also, that there is a danger of losing our *birth right*, even after we become heirs, as was the case with Esau. And as we become heirs when we are born again, the inheritance for which we then receive a right, (including as we discover the *bliss of heaven*,) must be understood as our *birth-right:* and as certain as Paul reasoned correctly, we have it in our power to forfeit that *inheritance*, or sell our birth-right, beyond the possibility of recovery, and our doom, like Esau's, be irrevocably fixed! "You know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was *rejected;* for he found no place of repentance, [or of changing his father's sentence,] though he sought it *carefully with tears*." (Heb. 12. 17.) Awful declaration!

17. "To present you *holy*, and *unblamable*, and *unreprovable* in his sight, IF YE CONTINUE IN THE FAITH, GROUNDED and SETTLED, and be not MOVED AWAY from the hope of the gospel." (Col. 1. 22, 23.)

Remarks: Universalism teaches the unconditional HOLINESS, as well as happiness of all mankind: that is, without any condition to be performed in this life. But the apostle here emphatically asserts, that, in order to be presented "*holy*" in the sight of God, we must attend to conditions in this life,—we must "CONTINUE IN THE FAITH," and "be not MOVED AWAY from the HOPE OF THE GOSPEL." If Universalists could dispose of this proof, I should despair of attempting to prove that God said: "Let there be light, and there was light."

18. "For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." (1 Tim. 4. 8.)

Remarks: This testimony is as plain and as positive, as language can make it; that the *life to come* is suspended upon the practice of GODLINESS! It cannot be contended that the *life to come* in this text signifies the spiritual life of the gospel, or the present enjoyment of the christian;—for this those brethren were then in possession of; and hence, the *life to come*, must have reference only to the life beyond the resurrection!

19. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ,—to an INHERITANCE INCORRUPTIBLE, and UNDEFILED, and that FADETH NOT AWAY, reserved IN HEAVEN for you, who are kept by the POWER OF GOD, THROUGH FAITH unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." (1 Pet. 1. 3–5.)

Remarks: This language cannot possibly be evaded. It teaches, that the *inheritance* for which the saints *hoped*, was *incorruptible*,—that same word *aphthartos*, which is never applied to any thing, except the bliss of heaven. It teaches in the second place, that this *inheritance* is actually "IN HEAVEN;" and the apostle Peter, in that same connection, uses the word heaven in such a manner, as demonstrates his meaning to be the *world* of *celestial glory!* "By them that have preached the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from HEAVEN." [Ib. 12.] This clearly shows where this *incorruptible inheritance* is to be enjoyed. And it teaches in the third place, that this *incorruptible, heavenly inheritance* is conditional, and to be enjoyed by those "who are *kept* by the power of God, through faith." Paul explains this power of God, and declares: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." [Rom. 1. 16.] Those then who are kept by the gospel, (which can only be by obeying its *precepts*,) are the ones who are ultimately to enjoy that incorruptible inheritance, *within the vail*, whither the forerunner has for us entered! But it may be objected

that this incorruptible inheritance is "to be revealed in the *last time*," and the apostle says: "Even now are there many anti-christs, whereby we know that it is the *last time*." (1 John 2. 18.) But what last time? There are various last times spoken of in the scriptures.—There were the last times of the Jewish dispensation, and the apostle testifies that Christ "was manifest in these *last times* for you." (1 Pet. 1. 20.) There was also the "*last time*" of the apostolic embassy, or of miraculous demonstration; when, as the apostle John declares, anti-christ should come to deceive the very elect, if possible. But neither of these is the *last time*, when the saints shall enjoy that incorruptible inheritance that fadeth not away! Paul, treating on the resurrection, (1 Cor. 15. 24,) says: "Then cometh the *end*," or the "*last time*," when those who are Christ's, or who have been "kept by the power of God, *through faith* unto salvation," shall enjoy this incorruptible inheritance; for he does there most distinctly affirm, that they shall be raised to INCORRUPTIBILITY, when death, the *last* enemy shall be destroyed!

20. "Be thou faithful *unto death*, and I will give thee a crown of life." (Rev. 2. 10.)

Remarks: Universalists can make nothing of this death, except the literal departure from this world. In making it signify a moral death, they turn the text into the most consummate nonsense "Be faithful until you are morally dead, i. e. *dead in sin*, and I will give you a crown of life!!" What an inducement to commit sin. It is therefore most manifest, that this "*crown of life*," as a reward of faithfulness, is beyond the natural death of the body, and consequently in eternity!

21. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." [Rev. 3. 21.]

Remarks: Neither can this language be applied to any station or privilege which those who overcame, were to enjoy in this life. How did Christ overcome. Ans. By continuing faithful unto death. When was he seated with his Father upon his throne? Ans. When he arose from the dead, and ascended to *heaven!* This text pointedly affirms: that we are to *overcome* and set down upon a throne, "*even as*" Christ did! Hence, we are not to overcome, until we have held out faithful *to death;* and we cannot set down with Christ in his throne, until, like him, we arise from the grave, and ascend to heaven! But remember that this glorious privilege is suspended upon the condition of OVERCOMING, or continuing FAITHFUL UNTIL DEATH! Forget it not!

22. "Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, *looking unto Jesus*, the author and finisher of our faith; who for the JOY THAT WAS SET BEFORE HIM, endured the cross, *despising the shame*, and is set down on the right hand of the THRONE OF GOD." [Heb. 12. 1, 2.]

Remarks: Here the saints are pointed to Christ as an example; and his *enduring* the cross, and *despising* the shame, in order to obtain "THE JOY THAT WAS SET BEFORE HIM," namely: exaltation to the "*right hand of the throne of God*," is held out as an inducement to the saints, to bear patiently their persecutions, with the exceeding great and precious promise, that "if we suffer, we shall also reign with him." (2 Tim. 2. 12.) The apostle also gives them to understand concerning Christ: "Though he were a Son, he learned obedience by the things which he *suffered*, and being made *perfect*, [that is, exalted into the presence of God,] he became the author of *eternal salvation*, to all them that *obey him*." (Heb. 5. 8, 9.) All that will *obey him*, shall be raised to the same glorified, and dignified station which he himself occupies, as the result of his unfeigned obedience. Query: If it were necessary for Christ, the lovely Lamb of God, to bear

the cross and be made *perfect* by *obedience*, in order to obtain a seat at his Father's right hand, as we are here informed; what should we think of the man who would dare affirm, that the wicked, who live and die in utter rebellion against Christ, will be just as infallibly certain of that crown, and wreath of everlasting honor, as the Messiah himself?

23. "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on *eternal life*." (1 Tim. 6. 12.)

Remarks: I have, in the preceding chapter, proved, that neither Christ nor the apostles speak of "*eternal life*," or "*everlasting life*," only with direct reference to the immortal state of existence. I here re-assert, that there is not one text to be found in the New Testament, where the phrase eternal, or everlasting life, signifies the present spiritual life of the christian. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that such was sometimes its signification, still it could not possibly have that meaning in the above text. Timothy was undoubtedly a christian, and in actual possession of all the present spiritual enjoyment, which the Gospel in its nature was calculated to afford; yet he was not in possession of *eternal life*, for he had to fight the good fight of faith, before that celestial boon could be enjoyed! He was also to instruct others, who, though like himself, were in the enjoyment of the present salvation; to lay "up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may *lay hold* on *eternal life*." (Ibid. 19.) These facts and considerations demonstrate beyond controversy, that "*eternal life*," belongs to the future state; and it just as evidently follows, hence, that our endless beatitude depends upon the characters we form here in time!

24. "Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised CHRIST SHALL PROFIT YOU NOTHING!" (Gal. 5. 2.)

Remarks: Our salvation for time and eternity, as Universalists admit, is staked upon the merits of Christ. "NEITHER IS THERE SALVATION IN ANY OTHER, for there is *none other name under heaven*, given among men, *whereby we must be saved.*" (Acts 4. 12.) And had not Christ have died, the whole human race would have been eternally damned, or saved in their sins; for, "without shedding of blood, there can be *no remission.*" (Heb. 9. 22.) Yet notwithstanding all this, the apostle taught the brethren who were converted from among the Jews, that should they renounce justification by the faith of Christ, and seek it by going back to circumcision and the law of Moses, Christ should *profit* them NOTHING!! It would be precisely the same as though Christ had not died; for the apostle does affirm, with direct reference to this point: "If righteousness came by the *law*, then *Christ is dead* IN VAIN!!" (Gal. 2. 21.) If Universalists, to escape this difficulty, should take the ground, that Christ benefits men only with respect to time, and that they may be saved eternally nevertheless, they only renounce Universalism in another way, by giving up the promise to Aoraham; as well as three-fourths of all their other proof-texts, for they are based upon Christ as the Saviour of the world! But since the Saviour has positively affirmed, that no man can come unto the Father but by him, (John 14. 6,) it follows, therefore, that had not Christ have died, the posterity of Adam would have eternally perished, or been saved without coming to God! Take the argument which way you will, it is a death-blow to Universalism!

25. "For he that is entered into his *rest*, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his; let us *labor therefore* to enter into *that rest*, lest any man *fall* after the same example of unbelief." [Heb. 4. 10, 11.]

Remarks: This is our closing argument, and a most sweeping one it is. The apostle here informs us, that we must *labor* to obtain *that rest*, into which Christ en-

tered, when he had finished the work of redemption, as God rested when he had consummated the work of creation. In order to know what *rest* Christ entered into, when he had finished his work, we shall hear the apostle in the same connection. "Seeing, then, that we have a great High Priest, that is *passed into the heavens*, Jesus the Son of God." [Ib. 14.] "Let us *labor therefore* to enter into ☞THAT REST!" But the apostle makes the matter even stronger, if possible, in the first verse of this chapter: "Let us therefore *fear*, lest a promise being left us of entering into *his rest*, any of you should seem to COME SHORT OF IT." From all this it is as evident as language can make it, that "His Rest," or "That Rest" most unquestionably signifies "Heaven Itself," into which, as Paul here affirms, Christ has entered, High Priest over the house of God: and it is also as manifestly evident, that this *rest* can be forfeited by disobedience, and that it actually will be, unless we "*labor*" to enter into it! But Universalists will try to evade this argument, by assuming that the rest here referred to, is the spiritual rest of the believer in the church: and will quote the third verse of this chapter, no doubt, as proof! "We which have believed, *do enter into rest*." This, it is said, proves *that rest* to be then present. Not quite so fast. Paul, speaking of the general resurrection, says: "But some man will say, how are the dead raised up? and with what body *do they come?*" [1 Cor. 15. 35.] Here is the same word *do*, though *present* in its natural signification, it is applied to the future resurrection. It signifies the same precisely, as if he had said: "With what body *shall* they come?" Thus we understand the apostle: "We which have believed, *shall* enter into *rest*," at the resurrection of the dead!! But the whole connection forbids the above assumption. Those brethren had just been addressed as *holy*. "Wherefore *holy brethren*, partakers of the heavenly calling." [Ib. 3. 1.] Hence, they were then in the enjoyment of the *present rest of the gospel*: and it would have been the very quintessence of nonsense, for Paul to exhort them to *labor* to

enter into *that rest*, when they were already in it, just as much as they possibly could be!

Reader: beware, "lest there be in you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God," [Ib. 12,] "and he swear in his *wrath* that you shall never enter into his rest!" [Ib. 13.]

"And should your ears refuse,
The language of his grace;
And hearts grow hard like stubborn Jews,
That unbelieving race:
The Lord, in vengeance drest,
Will lift his hand and swear:
You that despised my promised *rest*,
Shall never enter there."

CHAPTER V.

PERSONALITY OF THE DEVIL.

"RESIST THE DEVIL, AND HE WILL FLEE FROM YOU."—Jas. 4. 7.

Universalists deny in toto, that there is now, or ever was such a spiritual being as the *devil*, either real or personal; and contend, that all the idea designed to be conveyed by that word, is a personification of the principle of *evil*, in its various forms. It is applied in a metaphorical sense, they tell us, to various objects, such as *human nature*,—the *Roman government*,—*wicked men*, such as *Judas*,—*the lusts of the flesh*, &c., &c., but in every case it is to be understood as a figure of speech, and nothing more.

This *figure* was known, in days of old, and designated by many titles, expressing his character, attributes, and offices. He was called "*Abaddon*,"—"*Apolion*,"—"*Belial*,"—"*Accuser*,"—"*The Beast*,"—"*The Angel of the bottomless pit*,"—"*The great Dragon*,"—"*Beelzebub*," "*Deceiver*,"—"*The Evil One*,"—"*The God of this world*,"—"*A Murderer*,"—"*A Liar*,"—"*The Prince of this world*,"—"*The Prince of the power of the air*,"—"*The Old Serpent*,"—"*The Devil*,"—"*The Father of lies*,"—"*The Tempter*,"—"*Satan*,"—and "*The Prince of Devils*."!! [Rev. 9. 11. 12. 10. 19. 19, 20. 12. 7, 9. 1 Pet. 5. 8. Math. 12. 24. John 17. 15. 2 Cor.

4. 4. John 8. 44. 2 Cor. 6. 15. 1 John 3. 8. Eph. 2. 2. Eph. 6. 12. Math. 4. 3.]

He must truly have been an extraordinary metaphor, possessing doubly as many names as the Almighty himself! And I will disprove the existence of God, as a real personal being, upon the same principle precisely, that Universalists make out the devil nothing but a figure of speech,—a personification of a mere principle of evil!—If because Judas was called "*a devil*," [John 6. 70,] and Peter "*Satan*," [Math. 16. 23.] there is therefore no other devil, except Judas and Peter; then, according to the same logic, because Moses was called "*a god*," [Ex. 7. 1,] and Abraham "*lord*," [Gen. 18. 12,] there is therefore no other *Lord God* except Abraham and Moses! If, because God is said to perform many wonderful and mighty works, he is therefore a real being, and not a personification of a *good* principle; then, according to the same logic, the devil must be a real being, and not a mere personification of an evil principle, for many wonderful works, in the scriptures, are ascribed to him. He appeared in the presence of God, and they held a conversation together concerning Job. Mark the fact: they both conversed together; and if it be consistent to say that one was a mere principle of evil, the other was nothing but a mere principle of good!

Again: He caused a wind to blow down the house on Job's children, and kill them:—brought the Sabians upon Job's oxen, who took them all away,—caused the fire of God to fall from heaven, and burn up all Job's sheep: and finally, he smote Job with sore biles, from the crown of his head, to the soles of his feet. If this was all done by a figure of speech, they must have had rather a savage sort of metaphors in Job's time!! This same figure of speech conveyed the Saviour around from place to place,—conversed with him,—quoted scripture,—fell from heaven like lightning,—broke chains and fetters,—had power to cast men into prison,—to walk about as a roaring lion,—to work miracles—to overcome seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew,—to bind a woman eighteen

years,—to possess a herd of two thousand swine, and drive them down into the sea, and drown them,—is in possession of a kingdom,—is to be judged at the last day, —was conscious that there was a time coming, when he had to be punished,—confessed Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, is finally to be tormented in the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death: and strange to tell, all this is spoken of with reference to an eastern metaphor,—a figure of speech; and not any real being, visible or invisible, neither in heaven above, earth beneath, or the waters under the earth! [Job 1st and 2d chap. Math. 4. 6. Rev. 13. 13. Rev. 2. 10. 1 Pet. 5. 8. Acts 19. 16. Luke 10. 18. Luke 13. 16. Mark 5. 12, 13. Math. 12. 26. Mark 5. 4. 2 Pet. 2. 4. Rev. 20. 10. Math. 8. 29.]

If the devil, possessing all the foregoing characteristics, and performing all these wonderful exploits, be nothing but a metaphor, a mere principle of *evil*, then I defy a Universalist to prove, that God is any thing more than a mere principle of *good*, the opposite of evil; and that the bible is any thing more than a mere principle of humbuggery!

God and the *devil* are always spoken of in the scriptures as exact opposites, just as much so, as are the principles of *good* and *evil*. God is the author of *truth*, and the devil is the father of *lies*. God is the Father of *lights*, and the devil is the Prince of *darkness*. Hence we read: "Ye cannot serve *God* and *mammon*;"—"In this the *children of God* are manifest, and the *children of the devil*." "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *devils*, and not to *God*." "What concord hath *Christ* with *Belial*?" "He that *committeth sin is of the devil*,—whosoever *doeth not righteousness, is not of God*." "If *God* were your *Father*, ye would love me,—ye are of your *father* the *devil*." [Math. 6. 24. 1 John 3. 8–10. 1 Cor. 10. 20. 2 Cor. 6. 15. John 8. 42–44.]

All *good*, as the reader can discover from the foregoing quotations, is ascribed to *God*; whilst the *devil* is spo-

ken of as the author of all *evil*. Now as God is not merely that good principle, of which he is the author, neither is the devil that evil principle of which he is the author. Is the principle of evil the author of itself? If so, then the principle of good is the author of itself, and consequently all the God there is in the universe! Just as certain as God, the author of good, is a real being, just so certain is Satan, the author of evil, a real being, and not that evil principle of which he is the author.—Thus, upon the same principle, that the devil can be philosophized into a figure of speech, or a personification of a bad principle, can the Almighty Jehovah be figured out of existence as a real being, and proved to be nothing more than an Eastern metaphor, or rhetorical flourish.

But let us try some of the *real* significations of the devil, according to Universalism, such as the wicked Jews, —the Roman government,—Judas,—Peter,—human nature,—the lusts of the flesh,—the carnal mind, &c.

The best plan of testing a doctrine, is to substitute the definition for the word itself, and see what kind of sense it makes. We shall thus give the Universalist theory of no-devil-logic a fair trial. "And his fame went throughout all Syria, and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those that were possessed with *Roman governments*, and he healed them." [Math. 4. 24.]—"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the *Roman government* and his angels." [Math. 25. 41.] "And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: and after the sop, *Peter* entered into him." [John 13. 26, 27.] Or perhaps Judas entered into himself, since he was as much of a devil as Peter was! and of course before that he was out of himself! "Resist *Peter*, and he will flee from you." [Jam. 4. 7.] "Be sober, be vigilant, for your adversary, *Peter*, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." [1 Pet. 5. 8.] "And the Lord said: Si-

mon, Simon, behold *Peter* hath desired to have you, that he might sift you as wheat." (Luke 22. 31.) "And the God of peace shall bruise *Judas* under your feet *shortly*." (Rom. 16. 20.) "There was given me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of *Judas* to buffet me." (2 Cor. 12. 7.) "And he was casting out a *Judas*, and it was dumb: and it came to pass; when *Judas* was gone out, the dumb spake, and the people wondered. But some of them said: he casteth out *Judas* through *Peter*, the prince of *Judas*." (Luke 11. 14, 15.) "Ye are of your father *Peter*, and the lusts of *Peter* will ye do. He was a murderer from the beginning and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him." (John 8. 44.) "And he asked him, what is thy name? And the *human nature* answered, my name is legion, for we are many: —and all the *human natures* besought him saying, send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave, and the *human natures* went out, and entered into the swine, and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and were choked." (Mark 5. 9–13.) "As they went, behold they brought to him a dumb man possessed of a *human nature:* and when the *human nature* was cast out, the dumb spake, and the multitude marveled, saying, it was never so seen in Israel." (Math. 9. 33.) No wonder the people would marvel, that a man could speak, after his human nature was cast out of him! "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven *human natures*." (Mark. 16. 9.) I wonder how many she had left?! "And the Lord God said unto the *carnal mind*, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field, upon thy *belly* shalt thou go, and *dust* shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." (Gen 3. 14.) The carnal mind must surely have a singular mode of traveling, and live upon extraordinary diet!! "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand; and he laid hold on the *lusts of*

the flesh, that old *carnal mind*, with is *Judas* and *Peter*, and bound them a thousand years." [Rev. 20. 1, 2.] "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the *lusts of the flesh:* and when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungered: and when the *lusts of the flesh* came to him, they said unto him, if thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But he answered the lusts of the flesh, and said: it is written, man shall not live by bread alone; but by every word of God. Then the *lusts of the flesh* taketh him into the holy city, and placeth him on the pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him: if thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down, for it is written: He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus answered the *lusts of the flesh:* it is written, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Again, the *lusts of the flesh* taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, and said unto him, all these things will I give unto thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then said Jesus: get behind me, thou *lusts of the flesh*, for it is written: thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Then the *lusts of the flesh* leaveth him, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him." [Math. 4. 1–11.] Had Christ no *lusts of the flesh*, before the devil came to him? And after the devil left him, had he no more lusts of the flesh? If his own lusts, or his own carnal mind, was the devil that tempted him, was he not sinful? He certainly was: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God." (Rom. 8. 7.) His lusts were most unquestionably sinful, if they were the devil that tempted him; for that which is holy, will not try to tempt any one into wickedness! When the Pharisees told Christ he had a devil, it was looked upon then, and has always been, by professed christians, in all ages, as sheer blasphemy, until Universalists have recently made the discovery that the Pharisees told the truth, and that

Christ had just as big a devil as any body! If the devil which came to Christ, and went away from him, was not a real being—nothing but a figure of speech; then what were the *angels*, which came to him, after the devil left him? If they were nothing but metaphors, then how can any man on earth prove that Christ was a real being? He cannot do it, as we have two metaphors against the idea, and there is just as much reason in supposing that Christ was a metaphor, as either of the others! But if the *angels* were real beings, and *Christ* a real being, how can it be supposed, that the devil was nothing but a figure of speech, when he had fully as much to do in the performance as any of them?

"Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the *lusts of his flesh*, he disputed about the body of Moses." (Jude 9.) Thus, according to Universalism, a spirit had a contention with the *lusts of his flesh*, and the Saviour teaches, that "a spirit hath not *flesh* and bones." [Luke 24. 39.] If Universalists, to avoid this absurdity, should prefer the ground, that the archangel, did not contend with his own lusts, but with the lusts of Moses's dead body; still it will not help them: for they teach, that when the body dies, the lusts of the flesh become extinct; and thus the archangel was found combating something that had no existence, and fighting, as Paul says, like one that beats the air!

"And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the *dragon:* and the *dragon* fought, and his angels." (Rev. 12. 7.) As the *dragon* and his *angels*, were nothing but *figures of speech;* it is not likely that MICHAEL and his ANGELS were real being! Thus, we have two mighty armies of figures, meeting in battle-array on the plains of heaven, with two great metaphors at their head as commanders-in-chief!

"And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, even the *lusts of the flesh* are subject unto us through thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld the *lusts of the flesh* as lightning, fall from heaven." [Luke 10. 17, 18.]

"And no marvel, for *the lusts of the flesh* is transformed into an angel of light." [2 Cor. 11. 14.] "And when the thousand years are expired, *the lusts of the flesh* shall be loosed out of his prison." [Rev. 20. 7.]

From the foregoing, we discover that the *lusts of the flesh* does not suit exactly, as a definition for the *devil*: but we shall turn the matter, and try it the other way. If the *devil* mean *lust*, of course then *lust* means the *devil*.

"Now these things were our examples, to the intent that we should not *devil* after evil things, as they also *deviled*." [1 Cor. 10. 6.] "When the *devil* has conceived, he bringeth forth sin." [Jam. 1. 15.] "You ask and receive not, because you ask amiss, that you may consume it upon your *devils*." [Jam. 4. 3.] "Abstain from fleshly *devils*, which war against the soul." [1 Pet. 2. 11.] "All that are in the world, the *devil* of the flesh, the *devil* of the eye, and the *devil* of life, are not of the Father." [1 John 2. 16.] "The world passeth away and the *devil* thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." [Ibid. 17.] "The flesh *devils* against the Spirit, and the Spirit *devils* against the flesh, and these are contrary, the one to the other." [Gal. 5. 17.] "But they that will be rich, fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful *devils*, which drown men in destruction and perdition." [1 Tim. 6. 9.] "That ye put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful *devils*." [Eph. 4. 22.] "For of this sort are they, which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers *devils*." [2 Tim. 3. 6.] "The time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own *devils*, shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears." [2 Tim. 4. 3.] "How that they told you, there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly *devils*." [Jude 18.] "Flee also youthful *devils*." [2 Tim. 2. 22.] "And they slew of Moab at that time about ten thousand men, all *devilish*, and all men of valor." (Judg. 3. 29.) Thus, according to Universalism, we

have *divers* kinds of *devils*, such as "FOOLISH DEVILS,"—"UNGODLY DEVILS,"—"DECEITFUL DEVILS,"—"FLESHLY DEVILS,"—"HURTFUL DEVILS,"—"YOUTHFUL DEVILS;" and as all positive adjectives, imply their opposites: we must also have an other class, such as, "WISE DEVILS,"—"GODLY DEVILS,"—"SPIRITUAL DEVILS,"—"PEACEABLE DEVILS," "OLD DEVILS," &c. &c., and the Lord only knows how many more kinds of devils there are, if Universalism be true! Thus Universalists defeat their own object: for in trying to oppose the existence of ONE devil, they make out almost as many devils, as there were frogs in Egypt! They thus out orthodox old orthodoxy herself!

I wish here, to answer a very common objection, which Universalists almost universally urge upon this subject. "Every man is *tempted*, when he is drawn away of his own *lusts*, and enticed." "Christ was *tempted* in all points, like as we are." (Jam. 1. 14. Heb. 4. 15.) Hence, the conclusion is, that the devil which tempted Christ, was his own lusts. But we have examined Christ's temptation, and have found that the devil which tempted him, could not possibly have been his lusts; for it is most absurd to suppose that his *lusts* were *away from him* forty days, came *to him*,—stood *before him*,—got *behind him*, and finally *left him* for good and all!! Hence this objection can not be well founded. But, says one, how will you dispose of it? Easily enough! "Every man is *tempted*, when he is drawn away of his own lusts and *enticed*:" but who is the *tempter*? Who is the *enticer*? Not his own *lusts*, certainly; for they are the principle by which he is induced to partake of the temptation, after it is presented! But who *presents* it? That's the point. The answer is, the *devil*! Is he who presents the temptation, and that principle, which leads you to partake of it, after presented, one and the same thing? Not exactly! James does not say, that a man's *lust* is the *tempter*. Here is where Universalists mistake the whole matter. Let us illustrate it. Suppose, reader, a worthless and abandoned spendthrift comes to you, and *lays* every possible inducement before you, to *entice* or

tempt you to leave your work, and go with him to the "grog-shop." You resist at first, knowing that such a course of conduct is utterly repugnant to your profession as a christian. But "your adversary, the devil," through that wicked agent, (as all wicked men are agents for the devil,) still persists in his devices, and taxes the last coffer of his sagacity, in order to lure you from the path of duty. Your old contracted love for ardent spirits,—that *lust of the flesh*, which you had once overcome, is now excited and roused, and finally you yield the point, and are led away captive by the devil at his will! Now any man, with half an ounce of perception, can see that lust is not the *tempter*, or *enticer*; yet, when the temptation is presented by the *devil*, either personally, or by human agency, and we give way to it, then is the time that we are "drawn away of our own lusts and enticed." Thus would the Saviour have been tempted, had he yielded to the proposals of the adversary,—he would have been "drawn away [not *tempted*] of his own lusts;" but "*tempted* of the devil!!" The fact that Christ had all the lusts of the flesh before the devil came to him that he ever had, and that he retained them all after the adversary left him, ought to be of itself sufficient to convince any man, that the devil which tempted him, was not his lusts; and this being so, it follows, that the scriptural doctrine of the devil is against Universalism; although the *devil himself* may be in favor of it!!

In conclusion we remark, that there is not a text in the bible, which speaks of the devil as being the lusts of the flesh:—no, not one? But suppose there were a text, which figuratively applied the term DEVIL to the LUSTS OF THE FLESH; if this proves that there is no real personal devil; and that the lusts of the flesh is all the devil there is: then it follows, according to the same logic, because Paul says concerning some fellows, who were the enemies of the cross of Christ: "Whose *god* is their *belly*;" (Phil. 3. 19,) that there is therefore no other *God* in the universe except the *belly!* If this was all the *God* the bible held out, methinks that ATHEISTS among Universalists, *would be scarce!*

CHAPTER VI.

FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

"BUT HE BEING FULL OF COMPASSION, FORGAVE THEIR INIQUITY, AND DESTROYED THEM NOT."—Psalm 78. 38.

Of all the unscriptural, unphilosophical, and incoherent speculations, connected with the theory of modern Universalism, that which relates to the forgiveness of sins, is the most perfectly preposterous and unreasonable. This system of faith holds out the idea, that the sinner, by an immutable decree of the Almighty, is doomed, unconditionally, to suffer the full demands of justice, for every sin he commits (let that demand be little or much) before he can be forgiven; and that *forgiveness*, in no case, has the least tendency to shield off deserved punishment! This theory holds forth the sentiment, that, notwithstanding all the benevolent efforts, on the part of the Messiah, in bringing about a remedial system,—notwithstanding all the merciful provisions of the gospel of peace, with all its exceeding great and precious promises, and notwithstanding the God and Father of our spirits, out of the most pure and unbounded compassion, bowed the heavens, and gave his only and well-beloved Son, to suffer and die for the sinner; yet, there is no way made possible, by which he can escape the inflexible penalty of a broken law,—there is no mercy can be extended towards him, until he has supped

the last bitter dreg from the cup of punishment; and then, and not till then, will God forgive his sins!!

We expect, in this chapter, to urge several weighty considerations against this hypothesis; and endeavor to prove from the plain teachings of revelation, and the nature of God's moral government, that the forgiveness of sins consists, in a very especial manner, in the remission, or warding off of deserved punishment; and that there would be no such thing as the exercise of mercy in the economy of salvation, were such not the case!

Universalists make capital of several texts of scripture, which we shall examine, and which they claim as positive proof in favor of the assumption, that God never forgives the sinner, until he has inflicted upon him all the punishment his sins deserve. "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is *pardoned*, for she hath received of the Lord's hand *double* for all her sins."—[Is. 40. 2.] This is the most prominent text in the bible, upon which Universalists rely, as favoring the above position. But does this verse prove, that Jerusalem was *pardoned*, because she had received *punishment* to the full demands of justice? By no means, as we shall show. But suppose we admit, for the sake of argument, that "*double for all her sins*," does, as Universalists contend, relate to punishment, it would prove altogether too much for their theory, and consequently prove nothing. For if God did not forgive Jerusalem, until he had inflicted "*double*" the amount of punishment due "*for all her sins*," then, "take heed, lest he spare not you." Is this forgiving upon receipt of the full amount of punishment? Thus, you observe, reader, that this text refutes Universalists, take their own exposition of it. If God forgives the sinner, after inflicting double the demands of justice; may he not vary as much the other way, and forgive him when half the just amount of punishment is inflicted? And if God varies so much from the Universalist rule, as to inflict punishment to double the demands of justice, as they here admit; may he not,

on the same hypothesis, punish to all eternity? Is it not a true principle, that he who will be unjust in little, will also be unjust in much?

But the "*double*" which Jerusalem received, did not refer to *punishment*. The prophet, speaking of Jerusalem, bears me out in this assertion. "After all that is come upon us, for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God *hast punished us* LESS THAN OUR INIQUITIES DESERVE, and hast given us such *deliverence* as this." [Ezra 9. 13.] Thus it is manifest, that the *double*, does not refer to punishment; for Ezra positively informs us, that they were *punished less* than their sins deserved; and hence the "*double*" which they received, has reference to something else. But what! "For your shame you shall have double, and for confusion, they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore *in their land* they shall possess *the double;* everlasting *joy* shall be unto them." [Isa. 61. 7.] This will suffice upon that point.

Again "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." [Prov. 11. 21.] This is read in every book, and heard in every sermon in defence of Universalism. But even taking it in an unconditional sense, it contradicts Universalism; for, according to this doctrine, hundreds and thousands of wicked men, in the very height of their wickedness, fall instantly dead, and consequently slip off to heaven, and that too, *unpunished!* Universalists dare not take the ground, that *death* is the punishment for sin; for they universally teach, that God designed, when he created man, that he should die, and that death is in no sense of the word a consequence of transgression. (They thus make out *God* himself to be the *devil*, instead of the *lusts of the flesh;* for Christ came to destroy *death*,—Universalism teaches that death is a work of God, and John says, he was manifested to destroy the *works of the devil:*—hence *God* and the *devil* signify the same thing!!) Neither dare they take the position, that those wicked fellows who leave *this world without* punishment, receive it in the next: hence they

are compelled to admit, according to their own theory, that the wicked, (many of them,) *shall go unpunished!*

But in this text, as well as many other such expressions, there is a condition implied, though not *here* expressed, as in the promise to Abraham. (See exam. of Gen. 22. 18. chap. 1.) It is to be understood the same, (as we shall prove from another text,) as though it read thus: "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished, *unless they turn from their wickedness.*" This condition is *implied* in this case, because *expressed* upon the same subject in another connection. Hear it. "The soul that sinneth *it shall die.* [This is as emphatic as the expression, 'the wicked *shall* not go unpunished.'] But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he *shall surely live*, he *shall not die!*" [Ezek. 18. 20, 21.] or, (which is exactly the same,) the punishment which was threatened *shall not be inflicted!* Thus, notwithstanding God should threaten a wicked man with death, (which was *deserved punishment* unquestionably, or else God would not have threatened it,) still that wicked man can escape this punishment, by reformation and obtaining pardon, as certain as the prophet's words are to be believed. Hence, there is a condition *implied* in all such declarations, find them where you will in the bible! This rule of *implication* will be found an exceeding troublesome thing to Universalists, and in this, as well as in many other cases, it will put them to their wit's end perfectly!

Another text is presented. "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." [Exodus 34. 6, 7.] According to the Universalist exposition of this text, God will certainly punish a wicked man, all that his sins deserve, let him repent, turn from his wickedness, or do what he will! This makes the text most positively to contradict itself. "The Lord God, *merciful* and *gracious*, long-suf-

fering and ABUNDANT IN GOODNESS;" and therefore he will never cease to punish the sinner, let him repent ever so much, until the very last stripe demanded by inflexible justice, is inflicted!!! Two declarations, more palpably contradictory, are not to be found. It is about like this: "The Lord God, *merciful* and *gracious*, *long-suffering*, and ABUNDANT IN GOODNESS,"—therefore he will *damn* the whole human family without fail!!

But it may be thought that my view of the subject presents as much of a contradiction as the above. Not so. I contend with the bible, that God "will by *no means clear the guilty*,"—no, not by forgiveness, nor punishment, nor any thing else! But Universalism teaches that God clears the guilty by *punishment!* When in fact, let a man be punished ever so much, he is just as guilty as though he had not been punished at all. Put a man into the penitentiary three years for theft, and when he serves his time out, he is no more innocent, than when he commenced! But you ask how this apparent difficulty will be disposed of? In this way, and in this way only.—The guilty man must cease to be guilty, by becoming innocent; and he must become innocent, by complying with the Lord's own terms, and receiving the forgiveness of his sins, and the removal of guilt from his conscience! Thus, God can be *abundant* in *goodness*, and yet by no means clear the guilty. But he can clear the innocent, and be good to the guilty, in giving them an opportunity of becoming innocent,—obtaining the forgiveness of sins, and thus be cleared from suffering that punishment, which would most inevitably have been inflicted, had they continued guilty! This text, as we discover, proves the exact opposite of the Universalist theory, that forgiveness does not shield from justly deserved punishment. If there be no provision made, by which the sinner may escape the sentence of retributive justice, then the "goodness" of God is far from being "abundant!" Talking of a "God of cruelty," and "a *system* of vindictive tyranny," comes with but a poor

grace from those who look upon the character of God, as do Universalists! If the God and Father of our spirits be as destitute of the principle of mercy and goodness, as the doctrine of Universalists represents him, how they can infer a universal salvation, from his character and attributes, is a mystery which I do not, nor never expect to understand!

Let us now look at a few texts of scripture which clearly prove, that the mercy, or goodness of the Lord, being exercised in the forgiveness of sins, has shielded men from justly deserved punishment. The verse at the head of this chapter, is one directly to the point:—"But he being full of compassion, *forgave their iniquity*, and *destroyed them not*." [Psalm 78. 38.] From this it is evident, that the only reason they were not *destroyed*, was, because God "*forgave their iniquity*." This cannot be disputed. Now since God would certainly have destroyed them, had he not have forgiven their iniquity, it follows indisputably, that forgiveness in this case delivered from deserved punishment; for had they not deserved this destruction, there would have been no danger of the Almighty inflicting it! This testimony cannot be set aside!

Again: "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy;—*he hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities;* for as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his merey towards them that fear him: as far as the east is from the west, so far *hath he removed our transgressions from us*." [Psalm 103. 8–12.] Had we no other testimony, this one text would be of itself, all sufficient to eternally capsize the whole superstructure of Universalism, relative to the forgiveness of sins. It teaches, most unequivocally, that on account of God being MERCIFUL and GRACIOUS, he did not deal with men ACCORDING TO THEIR SINS, NOR REWARD THEM ACCORDING TO THEIR INIQUITY, but removed their TRANSGRESSIONS from them, as far as the east is from the west! This shows that God exercises mercy in forgiving men's sins, by not dealing

with them according as their sins deserve, or rewarding them according to their iniquity! Jeremiah prays to God concerning the wicked who had dug a pit for *him*: "FORGIVE NOT THEIR INIQUITY, NEITHER BLOT OUT THEIR SINS from thy sight, BUT let them be OVERTHROWN." This proves that they would not be OVERTHROWN, if God should forgive their iniquity; and as God would not overthrow them, unless they DESERVED IT, it follows hence, that forgiveness shields from deserved punishment!

Now hear the language of God to the prophet concerning Judah: "It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them; that they may return every man from his evil way, that I may FORGIVE THEIR INIQUITY AND SIN." [Jer. 36. 3.] And what would be the result? "If so be they will hearken, and turn every man from his evil way, that I may REPENT OF THE EVIL which I purposed to do unto them. [Jer. 26. 3.] Thus, when God FORGIVES a man's sins, he secures him from the PUNISHMENT, or evil which he had purposed to bring upon him, and consequently from the punishment which his sins deserve, for God would not, as we have before observed, purposed to bring punishment upon men, which they did not deserve.

The Sodomites were destroyed for their sins, and Christ informs us, that if they had repented, they "would have remained unto this day." (Math. 11. 23.) They would, consequently, have escaped deserved punishment; for Universalists dare not contend, that God inflicted upon them above their just deserts! Christ says: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke 13. 3.) Universalism says: "Ye shall all likewise perish, if ye deserve it, whether ye repent or not; for neither repentance, forgiveness, the mercy of God, nor any thing else, can possibly shield a man from deserved punishment." Here we are compelled into one of two conclusions: either that Universalism is false, or else that Christ did not understand it!

Again: Christ brings forward a similitude to illustrate the doctrine of forgiveness. "There was a certain cred-

itor which had two debtors; the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty; and when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both." (Luke 7. 41, 42.) The great matter in getting the true idea of a similitude, is to understand exactly the points of comparison; and not to make points, where there are none. In this similitude the points are four:—1. CREDITOR:—2. DEBTOR:—3. DEBT: and 4. The amount of money due in the debt. The *creditor* represents *God:* the *debtor* represents *man:* the *debt* represents *sin;* and the amount of money due, stands for the punishment due on account of sin. This cannot be disputed, with any degree of respect for common sense. Now we all know, that when a debt is forgiven, the debtor, as a matter of course, is released from paying the amount of money for which that debts calls: and who must not see, (if there be any sense in the Saviour's comparison,) that, when God forgives the sinner, the debt of sin is canceled,—the sinner released from paying the amount of punishment due on account of the *debt*, and God relinquishes all former claims against him, and both parties stand in the same relation precisely, as though the debt had not been contracted! This argument can be fortified by collateral evidence. We are taught by the Saviour, in what is commonly termed the Lord's prayer, to petition our heavenly Father thus: "Forgive us our *debts*, as we forgive our *debtors*." (Math. 6. 12.) Now, in order to be certain what is meant by the *debt* here spoken of, let us read Luke's version of the same prayer: "Forgive us our *sins*, for we forgive every one that is *indebted* to us." (Luke 11. 4.) Thus it is incontrovertibly established, that *sin* is the *debt* for which we are to petition forgiveness. All we have to do, in order to arrive at a correct understanding of the manner in which God forgives sins, is to ask ourselves the question: How do we forgive our debtors?—Common sense tells us, by relinquishing our claims against them, and releasing them from paying the amount the debt calls for. This Universalists themselves will admit, if they have the least particle of honesty. Does it

not follow then, most unquestionably, that God forgives us by canceling the debt of sin, and releasing us from paying the amount of punishment due on its account?—Universalists, as a matter of course, will try to twist out of this difficulty, (and well they might, as it subverts and uproots the very foundation of their theory;) and in order to this, they will no doubt deny that punishment is the amount called for, in the debt of sin; as there is no other position they possibly can take. But they admit, and contend, that there is punishment due for every sin we commit; and that it must certainly and inevitably be inflicted. We say so too, that is, unless the debt be forgiven. But if there be punishment due on account of our sins, as Universalists contend; who is it due to? Not to man certainly, although he has to suffer it, just as the man has to suffer the loss of ten dollars, when he pays a debt to that amount: but the amount of punishment is due to God, and to be paid or suffered by us, unless forgiven. Universalists deny the absurdity, that man, by any thing he can do, can bring God in debt to him; and hence the amount of punishment due, in the debt of sin, is due from man to God, and not from God to man!

A prominent Universalist once, when hard pressed upon this point, took the position, that love was the amount included in the debt which we owe to God: and quoted the Poet to prove it:

> "But tears of grief can ne'er repay,
> The *debt of love* I owe."

But this does not help their cause in the least. We freely admit, that we owe even a whole lifetime of love and gratitude to God; but this is far from being the debt of sin. "The debt of love we owe," is on account of what God has done for us; whilst the debt of sin is on account of what man has done against God. But suppose we should admit, that love is the amount included in the debt of sin, then it follows, when God forgives our sins, he releases us from the obligation of ever loving him any more!! But when the individual, above referred to, discovered the absurdity into which he had run

himself, he changed ground, and took the position, that God requires obedience on account of our sins; and that this is the *debt* to which the Saviour refers in the Lord's prayer. But this does not better the matter in the least. For, in the first place, it was due to God that we should obey him in every thing, even before we had sinned; or, whether we committed sin or not: and sin cannot certainly make that a debt, which was due before the sin was committed. And worse still; if our obligation to obey God be the amount due for the debt of sin, then, when the debt is forgiven, all claims for obedience are relinquished, and we are forever released from all obligation to obey God!! But from this position also, our hero soon fled, and assumed another, which he was certain would hold him safe. Forgiveness consists in God punishing men for their sins, as much as they deserve, and then saving them from committing sin in the future! Sure enough! This is certainly an improvement. Well, as we are to forgive our debtors as God forgives us, we must, therefore, when a man owes us five hundred pence, make him pay up the last farthing, and then be sure to never let him get in debt to us again!! Reader, what would you think of us, if you were indebted to us one thousand dollars, and we should forgive you according to the philosophy of Universalism? I know scores of individuals who would become very benevolent characters in forgiving poor men their debts, if they were only initiated into the sublime mysteries of Universalism!

But if God in all cases punishes the sinner all that his sins deserve, what then does he remit? Not deserved punishment; for that he must inevitably suffer. Not the sinner; for he goes free as a matter of right. Not future sins; for sins must first be *com*-mitted, before they are *re*-mitted. Not future undeserved punishment; for such punishment God never intends to inflict! What then, I ask, does the forgiveness of Universalism consist in? Ans. Nothing. Christ suffered and died for nothing, because man was in danger of nothing, except that which he would have to suffer any how: and finally, the

whole human family shall be eternally saved from nothing!! Glorious deliverance! I am here reminded of the anecdote of an infidel, who joined the Universalists, at the organization of a church in one of the eastern states. When the meeting had broken up, one of the by-standers addressed him: Mr. F. what made you join the Universalists? I thought you professed to be nothing. I do, replied he, and that is the very reason why I joined them, because they come the nearest *nothing*, of any thing I ever saw!!

As Universalists contend, that God never remits the punishment for sin, it follows hence, that the Sodomites will never be raised from the dead; for they died as a punishment for sin. How, then, can they be made holy and happy in the resurrection? And if, (as Universalists sometimes contend,) forgiveness is always consequent upon a full receipt of punishment, and that too, in order to prevent crime; then the Sodomites are not yet forgiven, as death, which was their punishment, yet holds its dominion over them; and they will not be, till they are raised from the dead, if that event should ever occur: and then we should like to have Universalists tell us, what crime forgiveness will restrain them from committing beyond the resurrection?

If Universalism be true, then there can be no such thing as repentance, in the common acceptation of that word, expected of any man in the universe. No man can repent of sins he has never committed: and as for repenting of past sins, it is all of no avail, as he knows he must suffer for them, penitent or impenitent, to the full demands of inflexible justice. Hence the doctrine of repentance is utterly out of the question, and ought to be expunged from the vocabulary of christianity.

Universalists sometimes speak of God in such a pathetic manner, that one would suppose him composed essentially of love, and that mercy was his only attribute: and then again, when we hear them descant upon his uncompromising strictness and severity, in punishing the sinner with the very last stripe demanded by infinite

and unmingled justice, let circumstances be as they may; we are led to conclude, that, instead of mercy forming any part of his character, he has far more the resemblance of a cruel and vindictive tyrant, than a God of unbounded compassion, and infinite benevolence! Look at the premises and conclusion. "God loves the sinner, with an undying and everlasting love; and is infinitely better to him than the most affectionate earthly parent can be to the son of his delight," and therefore he will never forgive him, and never cease to punish him, until he has made him to suffer the last stripe his sins deserve, let him be ever so penitent and humble!! What logic! What logic!

Yes, when God forgives a debt he makes the debtor first square up to the very last farthing, and then forgives him, after the debt is paid! Forgiveness is everywhere held out in the bible as a great blessing: and the way God *blesses* the sinner, is always to inflict upon him the severest penalty of a broken law, and make him suffer all that his sins deserve!! It is also a doctrine plainly taught in the bible, that God will *curse* men for their wickedness; and the way this is done, according to Universalism, is to *bless* them with *stripes of forgiveness!!* Thus, to *bless* with *punishment*, and *curse* with *forgiveness*, are all one and the same thing, if Universalism be true!

Now if this doctrine be not one solid compound of nonsense, and an incoherent bundle of absurdities, then I know not where such a bundle could be found. Universalists have certainly an altar erected and inscribed to an unknown God; for how they can profess to worship and adore a being of infinite goodness, and believe in the revolting and withering sentiments they do, relative to forgiveness of sins, is a problem which none can unravel, except the rabbinical literati of modern Universalian-divinity!

What would a prisoner, in the Ohio penitentiary, think of the Governor, if he should come to him, after he had served his time out, and offer him pardon? Why, he would look upon it as an insult to common sense; and

he would no doubt answer the Governor: I have a right to my liberty now, and no thanks to you, sir, for I have earned it by the hardest. I would have taken it as an act of kindness, had you pardoned me two years ago, and released me from the remainder of my deserved punishment; but now to offer me pardon and liberty as an act of mercy, when I have as good right to it, as any man in the state, is an imposition too gross for any man of principle to be guilty of.

Neither would the prisoner ever be induced to love the Governor from such sheer mockery, but exactly the reverse, as any one can see. All this applies in full force, to the *deity* of Universalism! If the Governor should forgive the convict in the midst of his punishment, it would have much the appearance of mercy, and would naturally call forth corresponding love and gratitude on the part of the prisoner. But there would be no mercy in the Governor forgiving the convict, and still keeping him in prison; neither would there be the least particle of mercy in pretending to forgive him, after he had suffered all the punishment that the law demanded. Hence we are inevitably driven into the conclusion, if Universalism be true, that *mercy* should not be numbered among the attributes of God! But suppose Universalists, to avoid this conclusion, should take the position, that, after the sinner is punished all that his sins deserve, God exercises mercy towards him, in warding off future punishment? To this I would reply: that the future punishment to which he may be exposed, is either his just deserts, or it is not. If it is, then the mercy of God exercised in forgiveness, shields from deserved punishment, which upturns the whole fabric of Universalism. But if this future punishment, to which the individual may be exposed, be not just, it requires nothing but justice on the part of God to shield him from it, and mercy has no hand in the matter! Hence, every exertion, made on the part of Universalists, to extricate themselves from the innumerable absurdities of their contradictory theology, the deeper and deeper are they

involved in the midst of insuperable difficulties, which are but the spontaneous products of the soil of Universalism.

But the doctrine of Universalism, upon this subject, can be also exposed, by comparing it with the forgiveness which christians are to exercise towards one another; for the apostle exhorts: "Even as Christ *forgave* you, *so also do ye.*" [Col. 3. 13.] Now, suppose a brother has trespassed against you, by maliciously slandering your character, or by fraudulently taking away your property; all will admit that such an one justly deserves to be punished. But suppose he comes to you, confesses his fault, and desires you to forgive him; you are bound to do it. Now do you not, by this act of mercy, shield the offender from deserved punishment? If you do not, then there is no mercy in the forgiveness, for he is precisely as well off without it as with it. But it should here be remarked, that God sometimes chastises the offender, in order to bring him to reformation, (as will be discovered in another part of this work,) and when this end is obtained, the transgressor is pardoned. But it does not follow from this, that the offender, in such a case, was punished all that his sins deserve. This assumption goes upon the hypothesis, that all punishment is disciplinary, and that sin, in no case, deserves any more punishment than will be for the good of the transgressor. But a more baseless fabrication has never been erected, as will be hereafter shown. But as God punishes, or chastises his children, to make them reform, and when this end is effected, forgives them, in order to shield them from the remainder of the punishment which their sins justly deserve; the same thing is also required of the church; and we have an example recorded in confirmation of this very position. "Sufficient to such a man is this *punishment*, which was inflicted of many: so that contrariwise ye ought to *forgive him.*" [2 Cor. 2. 6, 7.] But did he receive all the punishment his sins justly deserved? By no means: but his punishment was "*sufficient*" to reform him; and hence the church is exhorted to exercise mercy

towards him in *forgiving* his iniquity, and not to punish him according to the strict demands of unmitigated justice!

But there is another view of the subject, which we intend now to present, which must *lay out* the doctrine of Universalism, and put it forever at rest. We take this position at the start: that if there be no such thing in the economy of salvation, as releasing the sinner from suffering any punishment which his sins justly deserve, then Christ suffered in vain, and might as well never have left the bosom of his Father, for all the benefit we can derive from his death! In sustaining this position, it will be discovered, that the whole theory of Universalism, connected with this subject, is based upon a palpable misunderstanding of the atonement of Christ. It may be considered almost like attempting to prove that fire will burn, in arguing the above proposition; for it is as axiomatic as that two and two make four. If man, by an irrevocable decree of Jehovah, is doomed unconditionally to suffer all that his sins deserve, as a pre-requisite to pardon; could he not then, I ask, have suffered this full amount of punishment, as well without the sufferings of Christ, as with them? Again: If all that is necessary, as a pre-requisite to forgiveness, is for the sinner to suffer out the full demands of justice; then could not God have been just, and the justifier of him who was sufficiently punished, as well without the death and sufferings of Christ as with them? Once more: If Christ suffered and died for the sins of men, and if men have to suffer for their own sins all the punishment they deserve before they can be forgiven, then does it not follow, that either Christ or the sinner suffers *unjustly?* But finally: If the scriptures do teach that Christ suffered and died, on account of our sins, does it not follow, incontrovertibly, that when we accept of the merits of Christ, we are thereby released from suffering the punishment due on account of our sins, because of the sufferings of our surety? If not, then in the name of reason, what benefit do we derive from the sufferings of Christ? *Just none at all!*—

From this it is most indisputably evident, if Universalism be true, that Christ might just as well have saved himself the trouble (I speak with reverence) of coming down into this sinful and wretched world, and suffering the shameful and ignominious death of the Roman crucifix, for the sins of men; since, in fact, all his prayers and groans, and sweat and blood, are of no avail, and have not the least particle of tendency towards bettering the sinner's condition, or shielding him from any punishment to which he is exposed! For, according to this cruel and hard-hearted system, God had decreed by his immutable council, that no reprieve,—no sacrifice,—no atonement,—no mediation,—no pardon,—no justification,—no repentance, nor any, nor all other things combined, could have the least tendency towards mitigating the sinner's punishment! No, reader, nothing does this system of rentless tyranny hold forth, as the "glad tidings of great joy" to the sinner, let him be ever so penitent, but the bitter cup of sufferings, which he is compelled to drink to the very dregs, before ever the sceptre of pardon can be extended!

"If such the sweetness of the stream,
What must the fountain be?"

Paul affirms that "Christ died to save sinners;" but what from? Not from sin, for punishment does that.—Not from punishment, for this they are compelled to suffer! The penalty of the *broken law* must in all cases be inflicted, and never, until this is done, can the sinner become righteous: and thus it is demonstrated, if this view of the subject be correct, that righteousness comes by the *law;* and hence we are compelled to come to the same conclusion the apostle did: "*If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.*" [Gal. 2. 21.] But as righteousness does not come in this manner, we are bound still to believe with Paul, how much soever it may cross the track of Universalism, that "*Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.*" [Gal. 3. 13.]

Universalists contend that Christ died to commend the

love of God to man, and quote the apostle to prove it: "But God *commendeth his love towards us*, in that, while we were yet sinners, *Christ died for us.*" [Rom. 5. 8.] This, however, is a fatal text to Universalism: for if God commanded his love towards us, in giving Christ to suffer and die; then it is certain that we must derive some benefit from his death and sufferings, which, we have discovered, cannot be the case according to Universalism! Had Paul believed the absurd and blasphemous assumption of Universalism, he would undoubtedly have expressed himself differently. "But God commendeth his *vengeance* towards us, in that whilst we were yet sinners, in great need of assistance, he made his only begotten Son, to suffer and die the shameful and ignominious death of the cross, for nothing at all; as every sinner has to suffer just as much exactly, as though Christ had not died." If this is commending the love of God to man, then *love* and *wrath* are synonymous terms!

Some of the orthodox have gone upon extremes the other way, and Universalists have taken advantage of this circumstance, and made it a pretext for denying in toto, the doctrine of vicarious atonement. It is true, that one extreme naturally begets another; but still this is no reason, because some have abused the doctrine, that Universalists should therefore deny it altogether. It is argued by some, that Christ absolutely paid off the debt of sin to God, and suffered in his own person all the punishment due, for all the sins of Adam's race! Then, Universalists ask, do the sins of men deserve endless damnation? If so, did Christ suffer endless damnation? If so, then he is suffering still, and will continue to suffer to all eternity! This difficulty cannot be disposed of, according to the above position. Another objection urged against this view of the subject, is, that if Christ paid off the debt, and suffered all that our sins deserved; then no thanks to God for our salvation, for the glory and gratitude are all due to Christ alone! But a third objection urged against the doctrine of pay-up, is, that it makes it absolutely necessary for each individual to com-

mit just so much sin; if not, then there would be a danger of Christ paying too much, or else not enough! But all these difficulties can be easily and satisfactorily disposed of, if we look at the object of Christ's sufferings, in the true light of revelation. Although Christ suffered in our stead, and bore our sins in his own body, yet it does not follow hence, that Christ must necessarily have suffered all the punishment our sins deserve. The true doctrine is this, as the scriptures clearly and abundantly teach, that Christ as a days-man, suffered only enough to make a reconciliation possible, and make it just for God to forgive the sinner, and shield him from his deserved punishment. The apostle declares: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time his *righteousness*, (or *obedience* in suffering upon the cross,) *that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.*" [Rom. 3. 25, 26.]—Hence, God could not, without violating his justice, have pardoned the sins of one of Adam's race, had not Christ have suffered for our sins—the just for the unjust. Thus Christ having suffered enough, and only enough, to bring man within the reach of God's mercy, that he might be just, and at the same time deliver him from the punishment which his sins justly deserved, upon the condition of submitting to the terms of pardon, makes the debt of gratitude for this great salvation, due from the sinner, equally to God and to Christ. God was willing to save the sinner from the punishment due on account of his sins, providing the sinner was willing to be saved; yet he could not do it, without violating his immutable justice, unless Christ, as an infinite sin-offering, should voluntarily suffer in our stead, enough, that mercy might reach us, and the justice of God be sustained. Universalists may laugh at this idea, but, in doing so, they are only laughing at the apostle Paul, and unvailing their infidelity, which always laughs at any doctrine which holds forth the real character and heinousness of sin.

We shall now close this chapter, by presenting the contrast between Universalism and the bible, with reference to the sufferings of Christ:

Bible: "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." [Rom. 3. 24.]

Universalism: Being justified out of pure necessity, through the virtue there is in punishment.

Bible: "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." [Is. 53. 4.]

Universalism: Surely we shall bear our own griefs, and carry our own sorrows; and therefore, Isaiah, surely you are mistaken!

Bible: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." [Verse 5.]

Universalism: We must all be wounded for our own transgressions, and bruised for our own iniquities, just as much as though Christ had not been bruised at all!

Bible: "The chastisement of our peace was upon him." [Ibid.]

Universalism: The chastisement of our peace must be upon our own heads, notwithstanding!

Bible: "With his stripes we are healed." [Ibid.]

Universalism: With our own stripes we are healed, and not until we receive the very last one!

Bible: "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." [Verse 6.]

Universalism: The Lord hath laid on us all our own iniquity, and there is no possible way for us to escape the penalty, any more than if Christ had never died!

Bible: "For the transgression of my people was he stricken." [Verse 8.]

Universalism: The people shall be stricken for their own transgressions, and the sufferings of Christ cannot help them in the least.

Bible: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." [Verse 11.]

Universalism: By the virtue there is in punishment,

shall my righteous servant justify many, for they shall all bear their own iniquities!

Bible: "Forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." [Eph. 4. 32.]

Universalism: Forgive one another, even as God for the sake of punishment forgives every one that is forgiven!

Bible: "Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." (Acts 3. 19.]

Universalism: Wait patiently, until you are punished as much as your sins deserve, and they shall then all be blotted out, as a matter of course, and you need not expect it before!

Bible: "For Christ hath suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." [1 Pet. 3. 18.]

Universalism: Every unjust man must suffer for his own sins, until they are paid up, and thus punishment will make him just, and bring him to God, independent of the sufferings of Christ!

Bible: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." [Gal. 3. 13.]

Universalism: We must redeem ourselves from the curse of the law, by suffering all the penalty which the law demands, and ergo, Christ suffered the curse for nothing!

Bible: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned."—[Mark 16. 16.]

Universalism: He that believeth and is baptized shall not be saved, unless he has first suffered all the punishment his sins deserve; and he that believeth not shall be damned, and he shall be damned any how, if he deserves it, whether he believe or not; for every man must first pass through the punishment of damnation, before his sins can be forgiven!

Bible: "Who his own self, bear our sins in his own body on the tree." [1 Pet. 2. 24.]

Universalism: We our own selves, are compelled to

bear our own sins, in our own bodies, until we have suffered all the punishment which justice demands; and the death of Christ is of no more avail, than the death of Nero!

Now reader, can you believe Universalism, and at the same time believe the bible! If so, may the Lord assist you to open your eyes, unstop your ears, and stir up your *conscience*, whilst you examine the following article:

CHAPTER VII.

COMPUNCTIONS OF CONSCIENCE.

"SPEAKING LIES IN HYPOCRISY, HAVING THEIR CONSCIENCE SEARED WITH A HOT IRON."—1 Tim 4. 2.

Universalism confines all punishment for sin to this life; and as it is a stubborn fact, which Universalists, as well as others, are compelled to admit, that wicked men, as a general thing, in point of worldly prosperity, are equally as successful as the righteous, and many times more so: hence, it is contended, that the punishment which God invariably inflicts upon the sinner, is mental anguish, or remorse of conscience.

Universalists have been allowed to say and write almost any thing and every thing upon this subject, without being formally and effectually opposed; and some have even yielded up the whole ground, as being too metaphysical and abstruse to do any thing with; whilst others have conceded enough, (by admitting, that God does sometimes punish men severely for their sins, with the upbraidings of a guilty conscience,) to give Universalism a good foot-hold, and a firm clinch with both hands!

It is true, I have sometimes seen this subject casually noticed, in works opposed to Universalism, and occasionally, perhaps, a difficulty or dilemma presented in *opposition to the doctrine*; but nearly always concessions

enough in the same connection, not only to strengthen the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees of Universalism; but also to nullify the force of all the arguments they had there presented. For this reason, I have concluded to devote an entire chapter to the consideration of this supposed intricate question, and if Universalism be not weighed in the balance and found wanting, then set me down as a false prophet.

It must be admitted on all hands, that the punishment which God inflicts for sin, must be dealt out upon the principles of equality and justice, that is, the man who is the greatest sinner, should suffer the severest penalty. This will not be disputed. But is such the real state of the case, admitting the truth of the assumption, that remorse of conscience is the only divine punishment now to be inflicted for sin? Nay, verily! To this the reader's attention shall now be directed.

The apostle declares, in the text quoted at the head of this chapter, that certain characters had become so wicked and depraved, that their *consciences were seared* with a hot iron. In another place he gives us to understand what he means by this phrase: "Who being PAST FEELING, have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness." [Eph. 4. 19.] Now as certain as the apostle has told the truth, that wicked men can become so debased, and that their consciences will become seared to such an extent, that they get past feeling, and consequently are devoid of all remorse; then it follows, that the more wicked men can get, the less punishment they have to endure, until finally they can get so bad, as to get out of the reach of all punishment, and then they can go ahead, and the Almighty can do nothing with them, since their consciences are so seared as to be past feeling any thing like remorse; and he dare not, according to Universalism, punish them in the future state!

We not only have the testimony of the apostle, that *a man* may become so hardened, as to have no more *compunctions* of conscience; but the observation of ev-

ery reader must bear witness to the same fact. Observe that youth, when he commences the practice of profane swearing. The first oaths he utters, strike to his heart a dagger of the keenest guilt, and haunt his midnight hours of slumber. But, he continues the practice, and, like all wicked men and seducers, waxes worse and worse. But, as he becomes more and more profane, the Universalist's hell, instead of getting hotter and hotter, as it should, grows cooler and cooler, until finally the last spark of flame becomes extinguished, and the fire goes out. And now the result is, he can utter oaths, (the sound of which, would at first have made the blood to chill in his veins,) without feeling the least compunctions of conscience, and could even, almost at every breath, blaspheme the name of God, and damn his own soul to perdition, with a smile upon his countenance, and in the very height of worldly enjoyment! He is certainly situated in a very comfortable *hell* and the thoughts of leaving it, and going to heaven, I will venture the assertion, would be the most wretched feeling he ever experienced in his life: and I also firmly believe, that could he be induced to pray at all, his first, and most fervent petition would be, for God always to keep him in just such a hell as that! He could not be pleased better than to be eternally roasted in the fires of Universalism!!

It is certainly an incontrovertible position, which no one in his senses will dispute, that as men increase in wickedness, the lashings of a guilty conscience become less and less severe, until all moral susceptibility finally dies away,—the conscience grows callous, by oft repeated wounds, and the individual gets *past feeling!* This is seen in a boy, who commences his career of wickedness, by stealing a pin from his mother's sleeve. He has been taught that it is wrong to steal, and hence his conscience goads him for the deed. His next effort is in taking fruit from a neighbor's orchard. From this he goes to the store, and when unobserved, he slips a penknife *into his pocket*, worth half a dollar. He next pro-

ceeds to the gambling shop, where, by drinking and gaming, he spends all his money; and, to make up his loss, he takes his stand in the highway with sword and pistols, and robs a traveler of a thousand dollars! And from this he is seen as a pirate, traversing the high seas, and with the most perfect impunity, butchering hundreds and thousands of men, women and chrildren, and sinking them to the bottom of the ocean; and all, too, with less remorse of conscience than he experienced, when first he took the pin from his mother's sleeve!—Now, according to Universalism, when this individual had committed the most trifling offence, and was consequently the least guilty, he was in the very hottest part of hell; but when he became the most wicked, and of course deserving of the severest punishment, the *hell* of Universalism *cooled off* just then, and this conscience-seared wretch, found himself entirely free from all restraint,—he had sinned himself clean out of *hell*, and was on the broad road to heavenly bliss, destitute of all punishment, wading up to his knees in the blood of slaughtered innocence!! It is of no avail for Universalists to contend here, as did George Rogers in the Pro and Con, that the fact of men being past feeling, and having their conscience seared, is punishment of itself! Singular punishment truly, and they cannot feel it! We might just as logically contend, that the swine which wallows in yonder mire, because insusceptible of feeling remorse, is punished for the sin of rooting down the fence, as to take the absurd position, that men are severely punished, when all the men in the universe could not make them believe, but that they were the happiest beings in the world! Go to that bloated sot, who is now, perhaps for the thousanth time, reeling under his load of strong drink, and, according to Universalism, in hell torment; look into his blue-red bloated face and blood-shotten eyes, and ask him how he feels; and if his tongue is not too thick to articulate an answer, he will tell you, he *never felt* better in his life! Ask him if he desires to be *more happy*, and he will tell you he does not: he is just

as happy as he can be: and yet he is in hell, where the worm dies not, and the fire is not quenched! If you wish to make that man miserable, only convince him that his destiny is to go to heaven, and your object will be accomplished; unless you should convince him at the same time, that there would be a distillery carried on there; and even then, he would prefer remaining in this Universalian *hell*, where he could be certain of it! It may be said, that although the man does not get his punishment whilst in this condition, but just wait till he gets sober! But how about that man who is always drunk, and never sober, until he wakes up, sober, in the paradise of God?! Such a man, according to Universalism, must certainly get to heaven free-toll, because he had got too bad to be punished! He had become so wicked, that the Universalian hell would take no hold on him; and hence, he must either be saved in his sins, or handed over to the orthodox!

Universalists appear to know, and talk, and write more about the terrible feelings of a guilty conscience than any body else; and I have sometimes been curious to know, whether they speak this of themselves, or of some other men. But I wish it to be understood, that I do not deny that men will have a guilty conscience, when they commence practicing iniquity: but I do contend, and every candid person must admit the same, that when they get so depraved as to be "*past feeling*," their conscience no longer goads them; and hence, if that be the punishment inflicted for sin, they go clear when they deserve the most, utterly destitute of any punishment at all! This doctrine must also naturally encourage the sinner, to push on as fast as he possibly can in the ways of wickedness, in order to get his conscience seared, and get past feeling as soon as possible, that he may then, and forever afterwards, be clear of punishment! But it may be objected, that although his conscience ceases to upbraid him, yet he is punished in another way; for the scriptures declare, that the wicked "shall not live out half their days." [Ps. 55. 23.] So much the better for

him, as he will get to heaven as quick again as he would had he been a decent man!

> The wicked shall not live out half their days,
> But, on account of their ungodly ways,
> Shall die, and strait to heaven then they'll go,
> To be forever free from pain and woe!
>
> 'Tis true the sting of sin is quite severe,
> But still there is no ground for men to fear;
> For wicked men will get to heaven first,
> And hence the best way, is to be the worst!!

No man will feel remorse of conscience for going to heaven, even if he should get there twice as soon as the Lord intended he should! If a man was a firm believer in Universalism, and should murder his neighbor, would he feel guilty for it? Why should he? God foreordained it, and the blessed doctrine of Universalism informs him, that it will all be overruled for his good! And as for the man whom he murdered, he has done him a kindness, by sending him off to heaven! Why then should his conscience goad him? No sir, 'tis all a hoax! No man, who honestly believes Universalism, will feel the least remorse, let him do what he will. As well might a big stone have compunctions of conscience, for rolling down a hill, after some one had started it, as for a man to feel guilty for doing what God had absolutely decreed, and what would be overruled for the greatest possible good of all parties concerned!

If a man is, as Universalism teaches, a mere machine, and not a moral agent, then there can be no such thing in existence, as compunctions of conscience. Let a man be convinced, when he steals his neighbor's horse, that he acts out of pure necessity, and not from freedom of will,—that God from all eternity had decreed that very act,—at that very time, and by that very instrumentality, and how much will his conscience goad him? *Just* as much, verily, as it would goad a man for being

born with but one eye! As certain as "*a free will is a chimera*," which the Pro and Con asserts, (page 290,) so certain is every thing like guilt or remorse of conscience "*a chimera*," and hence, Universalism, from root to branch, is predicated upon a chimerical baseless assumption. And here we discover, by logical deduction, the shere infidelity of the whole system, in denying in toto, human responsibility and divine punishment. "What need we of farther witness?"

But admitting all for which Universalists contend, upon this subject, still there are difficulties which must forever block up their way. They are compelled to take one of two grounds: either that *conscience* is, in all cases, and at all times, an unvarying guide, and an infallible criterion relative to the exact amount of punishment due for sin; or else that it is not. If it be not a correct rule, and infallible minister of justice, then it cannot be the Lord's plan of punishing sinners; for all must admit his rule to be like himself: "Without variableness or shadow of turning." But if it be in all cases an infallible guide, then it demonstrates the truth of endless damnation, for the consciences of hundreds and thousands of wicked men, have borne witness to this doctrine. Myriads have gone into eternity, with the most perfect assurance of their own consciences, that eternal perdition was to be their inevitable doom! Thus, let them meet which horn of this dilemma they please, it gores their doctrine to death!

But why should Universalists condemn us? They admit that punishment is a motive to deter from the commission of crime. If so, why condemn the orthodox, since they believe in the compunctions of conscience—all the punishment for which Universalists contend, and in addition to this, they believe in punishment beyond death; and hence, have all the incentive that Universalists have, and a great deal more! But they tell us, that from the penalty of Universalism, there is no escape for the transgressor; and "herein consists the moral power of Universalism." But the orthodox contend as much as

do the Universalists, that it is impossible for the sinner to escape the compunctions of conscience, that is, until his conscience becomes seared, and hence they have all the moral power for which Universalists contend; and in addition to this, they hold out the infinite motive of future and eternal punishment, which will be as certainly and inevitably inflicted as the other, unless a reformation of life takes place before death. More than this, the compunctions of conscience, under the belief of orthodoxy, must necessarily be much more severe, than under the belief of Universalism. A man dying in the thraldom of iniquity, with the firm conviction that everlasting destruction is to be his doom; who can paint, or even imagine the torment he must suffer, from the goadings and upbraidings of his guilty conscience? But let a man be brought upon a death bed, a firm believer in Universalism, (if such a case could be found,) and let him, if you please, be the wickedest man on earth, and where is his remorse of conscience? He has none, as every man, who can reason logically, must decide. He looks back upon his past life, and concludes, that notwithstanding he had done many things that people looked upon as wrong, yet God had decreed them, and hence they were right, as they would all certainly be overruled for good. And the thoughts of sin being such a harmless thing, as only to affect him in this short life, and even here, not enough to cause the loss of a minute's sleep on its account; and in addition to this, the thoughts of being transported, in a few minutes, from the dominions of pain and sickness, into the gardens of fadeless beauty, and the realms of uninterrupted felicity, would drive remorse as far from his conscience as the east is from the west! And if the doctrine of Universalism, as its advocates are compelled to admit, will let a man die in his sins, and die *happy* at the same time; will it not also, on the same principle, cause a wicked man to live in his sins, and at the same time go on his way *rejoicing?* Where then is the moral power of Universalism? The *sunkest system of* Deism has in it every feature of moral

estraint, connected with Universalism, and at the same ime does not hold out such infinite inducements to rompt men to practice iniquity, as does the system we re opposing, as will be shown in another chapter. As philosopher or philanthropist, I should therefore feel nyself bound to preach unadulterated Deism in preference to Universalism!

But what benefit, in point of punishment, do Universalists expect their doctrine will be to men in general? Cannot a sinner feel the compunctions of conscience until a Universalist preacher tells him how bad his conscience will goad him? If not, then for nearly eighteen hundred years of the christian dispensation, before Hosea Ballou made his important discovery, there was no such thing as punishment in existence! But if sinners an feel the sting of remorse just as sensibly without understanding the theory of Universalism as with it, then here is the necessity of preaching the doctrine? It ves no one from punishment. It holds forth no punhment, except that which the sinner understood just as ell before. It takes no one to heaven, and saves no ne in any sense, except the preacher perhaps from staring! Methinks the power of Universalism is not so uch moral as physical.

But the great truth relative to this whole subject, and ne of which Universalists appear to be entirely ignoant, is, that remorse of conscience, or anguish of mind, rises from the fear of God. Accordingly, in proportion o the amount that a man fears God, will be his guilt of onscience when he commits a sin: and if a man has beome utterly destitute of fear, he must necessarily have o remorse, let him do what he will. Now all that is ecessary, in order to effectually sift Universalism, is to how that some men are destitute of fear. Paul speaking of the character of wicked men, says: "Their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace they have not known, there is *no fear of God before their eyes.*" [Rom. 3. 15–18.] Such characters must necessarily be destitute of

all remorse, and hence, if the guilt of conscience be the punishment for sin, then Universalists are bound to admit, not only that myriads of wicked men go to heaven without any punishment; but that all a man has to do to get clear of punishment, is to persevere in the practice of iniquity, until he becomes so outrageously wicked as to have no fear of God before his eyes! Then he is clear of all remorse, and consequently of all punishment, if Universalism be true! And as this doctrine teaches, that God is a being who is not to be *feared*, it follows that no man will fear God, if he believes in Universalism, and hence, let this be the prevailing doctrine and remorse of conscience will come to a perpetual end.

But another difficulty facing this theory, will be seen in the fact, that the scriptures every where hold out the idea that *God* is to punish the sinner; but, according to this hypothesis, the *sinner* punishes *himself* by making his conscience goad him; and thus the Lord has no hand in the matter! The Psalmist says, that "the wicked shall be turned into hell." [Ps. 9. 17.] If a guilty conscience be the hell, threatened against the wicked, then the only way the wicked can be turned into hell, as the Indian told the Universalist, is to be turned wrong side out! If the punishment for sin be no more than the compunctions of conscience; and if, as Universalism teaches, sinners are bound to suffer all the punishment that their sins deserve, I see not what need we have of a Saviour; for a man's conscience, according to this theory, is his God, hell and Saviour, and could have answered every purpose, as well without the death and sufferings of Christ as with them.

It is certainly a most singular and unaccountable fact, if all the fearful denunciations and threatenings of the bible, against sinners, be no more than a little remorse of conscience, which nine-tenths of the wicked would rather endure eternally, than go to heaven the best way you could fix it. The "everlasting destruction,"—"lake of fire and brimstone,"—"second death,"—"eternal dam-

nation," — "fiery indignation," — "everlasting punishment," — "day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men," etc., etc., are all, according to Universalism, inside of the sinner; and strange to tell, more than one half of them know nothing about it!

Universalism teaches that this present time is all the day of judgment there is, or ever will be. But, according to this view of the subject, is it not most remarkably singular, that hundreds and thousands have lived all their lives in the practice of wickedness, and have died and gone into eternity, without having the least intimation, that they had passed through the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men; but were always looking for it ahead? Yes, if Universalists had told them, that they were then in the lake of fire and brimstone, suffering the everlasting destruction and eternal damnation of which the scriptures speak, they would have called such preachers a set of fools. What! we suffering everlasting punishment in the fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and not feel it? Away with such nonsense! It must be admitted by all, that the penalties annexed to the laws of God should be as much severer than those inflicted in any human government, righteously administered, as the laws of God are superior to those of man. And there must necessarily be as much difference between the laws of God and the laws of man, as between the authorities by which they are established. Now suppose the laws and penalties of a State government such, that a criminal, for the most vile and outbreaking offense, could be arraigned before the judgment seat,—tried,—condemned,—sentenced,—and executed,—and never know that any thing under the heavens had happened him! what would such a government come to? Would it lead the abandoned, profligate wretch, to fear and tremble at the awful calamity that would come upon him, which would be so terrible and dreadful that he would pass through it all, and never know nor dream that any thing had hurt him?!

Again: It is a fact worthy of observation, that men

may become so wicked, that they will experience more anguish of mind when they do right than when they do wrong. Mark that miser, wallowing in wealth, which he has wrung, with a tyrant's grasp, from the tears and groans of widows and orphans. The poor are crushed beneath his feet, and those from whom he had wrenched the last farthing of all their earthly support, are thrown out upon the charity of a cold and merciless world, whilst their proud and cruel oppressor is reveling in all the pomp and grandeur of a monarch's palace, and feasting upon the dainties and luxuries of distant lands; but, strange as it may appear, he is all the time in hell torment, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, and has never lost an hour's sleep on that account! Whilst the honest poor, who have been robbed of their hard-earned living, and are starving in their naked cabins, are now, according to Universalism, "eating of the tree of life, that is in the midst of the paradise of God." If this be the incorruptible inheritance, promised in the gospel, what an inducement to the saints! But that tyrant is in hell! Yes, and what better could you please a wicked man, than to threaten him with just such a hell as that! But I remarked, that it would cause such an one more anguish of mind to do right than to do wrong. I appeal to the good sense of the candid to decide, if the thought of giving up to the widow and fatherless that which he had taken from them wrongfully, would not cause him more unhappy feelings and anguish of soul, than to keep what he had, and get more in the same way! Whilst he thinks of nothing except hoarding up gold and silver, he rests contented; but when he receives intelligence that he must restore to the poor their earnings which he had kept back by fraud; his countenance changes, sleep flees from his eye-lids, and he pines under sorrow and distress. But what's wrong? Why, the poor fellow has to come up to the work, and do that which is lawful and right, and it breaks his heart, and almost grieves him to death!

But conscience cannot be a minister of justice, from

the fact that it is more severe under some circumstances, than others, even when the crimes are exactly the same. For example: a practical highway robber murders a man and takes his money. He has followed the business for years, and has become so habituated to cruelty that his conscience no longer upbraids him; and he has no more remorse for murdering a man, if he is certain it will not be divulged, than for killing a serpent. Accordingly he secures the victim of his savage cruelty, in such a manner as precludes all possibility of discovery, and he is seen strutting the streets as independently, and as little conscience-smitten, as though his hands were pure from the blood of all men. But suppose just as he had perpetrated this horrible deed, he should be arrested and brought to justice, and hear his sentence to hang by the neck till he was dead, dead! He is then thrust into prison to await that awful crisis. But O, the terror and dismay that now takes possession of his bosom, and the fearful forebodings of the awful destiny that awaits him, which now rake up his guilty soul! His conscience, which so long had slumbered, is now aroused, and lashes the wretch with scorpion stings of guilt, whilst within him is kindled a fire of the keenest anguish! But all this suffering, let it be observed, resulted from the mere accident of his being arrested. But had not this circumstance occurred, he would, as a matter of course, have escaped all this inexpressible anguish; and had he, at some future period, have fallen instantly dead, he would thus, according to Universalism, have escaped all punishment, and as no man can be forgiven till he is punished, he would consequently have been launched into eternity in his sins! And as he cannot be punished there, he must therefore remain in his sins eternally, and consequently remain eternally under the sentence of condemnation! This is the inevitable result, admitting the truth of the Universalist theory relative to the compunctions of conscience!

But the scriptures clearly teach, that the wicked fare better in this world than the righteous. Look at the

afflictions and persecutions of the righteous, enum
by the apostle in the 11th of Hebrews: "And othe
trials of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreo
bonds and imprisonments: they were stoned, they
sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the s
they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skir
ing *destitute, afflicted*, and *tormented*." [Heb. 11. 3
The Psalmist declares: "Many are the *afflictions*
righteous." [Ps. 34. 19.] But how is it with the
ed? The Psalmist shall answer: "For I was envi
the foolish, when I saw the *prosperity of the wick*
They are not in *trouble as other men*, [*righteous* m
course,] neither are they plagued like other men.—
eyes stand out with fatness, they have more that
could wish. They are corrupt and speak wickedly
cerning oppression, they speak loftily: they set
mouth against the heavens. Behold these are th
godly who prosper in the world." [Ps. 73. 3, 5–9
It is true, as says the prophet, that the wicked, b
their consciences became seared, are like the tro
sea when it cannot rest, whose waves cast up mir
dirt, and also that there is no peace to the wicked, v
in this condition. But it is also true, that wher
wicked become conscience-seared, and past feelin
morse, they "have *pleasure* in *unrighteousness*." [2'
2. 12.] It is true that they "*enjoy* the *pleasures* of
[Heb. 11. 25.] It is true that they "*count it pleas*
riot in the day-time,—*sporting themselves* with their
deceiving." [2 Pet. 2. 13.] It is true that they "
lived in pleasure upon the earth, and been *wanton*,
that they are "lovers of *pleasure* more than love
God." [Jam. 5. 5. 2 Tim. 3. 4.] It is true, that with
characters, "*wickedness is sweet*," and "their *rejoi*
is to *devour the poor secretly*." [Job. 20. 12. Ha
14.] It is true that "*they delight in lies*,"—that "
soul delighteth in their abominations," that "they *re*
to do evil," and that they "not only do the same, but
pleasure in them that do them." [Ps. 62. 4. Is. 6
Prov. 2. 14. Rom. 1. 32.] And it is true "that t

be just men, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked: again there be wicked men to whom it happeneth, according to the work of the righteous." [Eccl. 8. 14.] Thus we discover that the righteous in this world are compelled to endure all manner of afflictions, and privations; and many times to receive the reward due for the works of the wicked; whilst the wicked *rejoice* to do evil, *delight* in lies and abominations,—and have *pleasure* in unrighteousness! If this be the manner in which God rewards the righteous for their good deeds, and punishes the wicked for their evil deeds, then no rational man can look upon the moral government of God as any thing better than a system of shere hypocrisy and injustice.

But finally, we take the position, that compunctions of conscience, let them be experienced to ever so great an extent, are not punishment at all; and that Universalists must therefore admit that the wicked are punished in the future state of existence, or else deny punishment in toto; and thus strip the disguise from their doctrine, and give us what we ought to have had long ago, —*infidelity unmasked!*

There is a difference between the punishment for sin, and the natural effect of sin, and more than this, the natural, or immediate effects of sin, are no where in the bible spoken of, as the punishment which sin deserves. We shall, therefore, present several arguments to prove that compunctions, or remorse of conscience, are not the punishment for, but the natural effects of, sin!

The Jew, who broke the Sabbath by picking up sticks, had, doubtless, as much remorse of conscience, or anguish of mind, as any man can have now; yet this was not his punishment,—he had to be stoned to death,—die without mercy under two or three witnesses. This was called "a just recompense of reward." [Heb. 2. 2.]—Does God, at this time, punish sinners only with compunctions of conscience, when, three thousand years ago, he inflicted all that, and more than three thousand times as much? Can God do this and be immutable? The

truth is, remorse of conscience was no punishment then, neither is it now. If it is, then God is a respecter of persons, a position which the apostle emphatically denies. There have occurred only a few cases of divine punishment, under the christian dispensation, such as the death of Herod, when the angel of the Lord smote him, and that of Ananias and Sophira. [Acts 5. 5–10, 12, 23.] But did not these individuals experience as much remorse of conscience as do other sinners? And is it not frequently the case, that sinners die suddenly upon their beds, whilst enveloped in slumber, and thus go into eternity without a groan or struggle? Such cases frequently occur. Now if remorse of conscience be punishment, and if the theory of Universalism be true, then God is a respecter of persons, and punished Herod, Ananias, and Sophira unjustly. If not, then Universalists are bound to admit, according to their own logic, that remorse of conscience is not punishment, and that the wicked, who now go into eternity with nothing but the upbraidings of a guilty conscience, will receive their just deserts at the day of judgment, and the perdition of ungodly men; and in admitting this, they will agree with the apostle exactly: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the ungodly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." [2 Pet. 2. 9.]

When Christ said: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment," he referred, according to Universalism, to the Jews being driven away into captivity, at the destruction of their city. Well, if they were then driven away into punishment, it proves that remorse of conscience was not punishment, for they had this, as much as other sinners, long before their dispersion!

God has frequently threatened men that he would punish them for their sins, after a certain lapse of time; when, according to Universalism, he was punishing them all the while, and they did not know it!

But it may be thought that the peace of mind, which a *righteous* man enjoys, is his reward; and upon the same

principle the anguish of mind which the wicked suffer, is their punishment. Yes, one is just as certain as the other; but neither of them is true. Isaiah tells us that "the *effect* of righteousness, is *quietness*;" [Is. 32. 17.] and the Saviour, instead of teaching his disciples that they received their reward *in their consciences*, points their minds forward: "Great is your reward *in heaven*," and taught those who performed acts of kindness and benevolence; in calling in to their feasts, the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind, that they should be "recompensed at the resurrection of the just," and not that their recompense was the effect that those benevolent acts had upon their consciences!

Sin may produce many effects, and we have a right to infer one effect to be punishment for sin, as well as another. Let us see. Suppose you get in a passion, and strike your neighbor with an axe. It has produced two effects: your conscience goads you, and your neighbor is severely wounded. Now which effect is the punishment for sin? Not the one produced upon the wounded man; for that would be punishing him for your offence. This being true, there is no proof that the other effect is punishment either. If you think there is, then look at another case. Suppose you strike that man with your fist, instead of an axe;—the result is, the man gets a moderate bruise, but by accident you break your arm. In this case you did not commit as great a crime, as in the other; yet you have to suffer inconceivably the most. You not only have to suffer the lashings of a guilty conscience, but the additional pain of a broken arm. If the effect of sin be the punishment for sin, then which of these effects is the punishment? If either of them is, then they both are; for it would be the extremity of nonsense, to contend, that the effect upon the mind was punishment, and that the effect upon the body was not? But suppose they are both punishment; then the remorse of conscience which you experienced as an effect of the first crime was not just punishment; or else the two effects produced by the second crime were more than jus-

tice demanded! But as Universalists contend that remorse of conscience is the full demand of justice, it follows that the other effect cannot be punishment; as we have seen that one effect cannot be unless they both are!

There is another substantial reason that can be assigned why remorse of conscience, or anguish of mind, is not the punishment which God inflicts for sin. It is a truth, which Universalists themselves admit, that God never punishes the sinner after he forgives him. Now look at the case of Mr. W., who, in a fit of intoxication, murdered his brother Thomas. In an instant is laid dead at his feet, the husband of an amiable and confiding wife, and the father of six lovely children. No mortal can paint, or even imagine, the inexpressible grief which now takes possession of the hearts of that bereaved family. The man awakes from his rum, and beholds the outrageous crime he has perpetrated. He looks upon that heart-broken, and disconsolate widow, and those bereaved orphans, whose cries and lamentations pierce the wretch to the inmost recesses of his heart. O, had he ten thousand worlds, he would most gladly and willingly give them all, could he but undo that dreadful act. But alas, it is too late! That deed cannot be recalled, and its effects must remain, not only upon that afflicted family, but also upon the heart of that cruel wretch as long as life shall last. Although he may reform his life, and become a pious and devoted christian, and consequently his sins all be forgiven; yet that effect remains; and although God has, as a matter of course, ceased to punish him, if he ever punished him at all; still that anguish of soul remains; and at every sight of that distressed family, whose happiness he had wantonly destroyed for life, his sweetest reflections are mingled with the bitter dregs of sorrow and regret! This proves beyond all controversy, that the effect which sin produces upon the mind of the sinner, is not the punishment for his sins; for none dare contend that God will punish a man for his sins after those sins are forgiven!

Having thus shown that there cannot be such a thing

as remorse of conscience experienced by any true believer in Universalism,—that the theory of conscience-punishment exhibits the most positive scheme of injustice,—that it holds out the strongest conceivable inducements to encourage the sinner to persevere in his wickedness, in order to get beyond punishment by becoming conscience-seared,—that the wicked do absolutely prosper more in a worldly point of view, than the righteous, and that they enjoy pleasure in unrighteousness,—and finally, having shown that remorse of conscience, or anguish of mind, is not punishment for sin in any sense of the word, it follows hence, that Universalists do not believe in punishment at all! This is a grave charge, I admit, to prefer against any people, professing faith in the word of God; nevertheless it is true; and for their benefit especially, do I thus expose their infidelity; and I pray God that they may receive it as it is presented, in all kindness, and leave that muddy, rocky, snaggy pond, and come out where they can have fair sailing upon the broad ocean of consistency!

CHAPTER VIII.

TESTIMONY OF ONE HUNDRED WITNESSES.

"HEREBY KNOW WE THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, AND THE SPIRIT OF ERROR."—1 John 4. 6.

1. Bible: "If any man serve me let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be." [John 12. 26.]
   Universalism: Where Christ is there shall also the servant of the devil be!
2. Bible: "Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." [Acts 3. 19.]
   Universalism: Your sins shall all be blotted out, whether you repent and be converted or not!
3. Bible: "Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book." [Rev. 22. 7.]
   Universalism: The man who disobeys every word in this book, is just as certain of being *blessed* as the most obedient man on earth!
4. Bible! "If any man serve me, him will my Father honor." [John 12. 26.]
   Universalism: If any man serve the devil all his life, him will the Father honor, with a seat at his own right hand!
5. *Bible:* "The world passeth away, and the lusts there-

of, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." [1 John 2. 17.]

Universalism: There is to be no difference in the outcome between them who do the will of God, and those who do the will of the devil!

6. Bible: "That ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer." [2 Thes. 1. 5.]

Universalism: All shall be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, whether they suffer for it or not!

7. Bible: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even *weeping*, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction." [Phil. 3. 18, 19.]

Universalism: For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even *laughing*, that although they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, yet their end is *salvation!*

8. Bible: "And being made perfect, he became the author of *eternal salvation*, to all them that *obey* him." [Heb. 5. 9.]

Universalism: And being made perfect he became the author of *eternal salvation* to all them that *disobey* him!

9. Bible: "Wherefore my beloved brethren:—*work out* your salvation with fear and trembling." [Phil. 2. 12.]

Universalism: Wherefore my beloved brethren, you shall all have salvation whether you work or not! And as for fearing and trembling there is no necessity for it, as you are certain of salvation, let you do what you will!

10. Bible: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." [Mark 16. 16.]

Universalism: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not *shall be!*

11. Bible: "To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak, I am made all things to all

men, that I might by all means *save some*." [1 Cor. 9. 22.]

Universalism: What was all that for Paul? when all were certain of salvation (not *some*) without all that trouble!

12. Bible: "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." [Heb. 4. 9.]

Universalism: There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of the *devil*, as well as to the people of God!

13. Bible: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." [2 Pet. 2. 9.]

Universalism: The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and reserve the unjust unto the resurrection to be *saved!*

14. Bible: "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son."—[Rev. 21. 7.]

Universalism: "He that does *not* overcome, shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son if he die as wicked as Nero!

15. Bible: "For this ye know that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ, and of God." [Eph. 5. 5.]

Universalism: For this ye know, that all whoremongers, and unclean persons, and all covetous idolaters, are just as certain of an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God, as they are certain of being raised from the dead!

16. Bible: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." [Rev. 22. 14.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that do *not* his commandments, for they shall have right to the tree of *life*, and enter in through the gates into the city!

17. Bible: "When lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." [Jam. 1. 15.]

Universalism: Lust when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth eternal life!

18. Bible: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." [Math. 5. 7.]

Universalism: Blessed are the *unmerciful*, for they shall obtain *mercy!*

19. Bible: "Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." [Luke 11. 28.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that hear the word of God, and disobey it!

20. Bible: "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." [Math. 5. 6.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that *do not* hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall also be filled!

21. Bible: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." [Math. 5. 5.]

Universalism: Blessed are the wicked, for they shall inherit heaven!

22. Bible: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." [Math. 5. 3.]

Universalism: Blessed are the *proud* in spirit, for theirs is heaven itself, and that is better still!

23. Bible: "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." [Math. 5. 4.]

Universalism: Blessed are they that *will not* mourn, for they shall be comforted!

24. Bible: "Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the children of God." [Math. 5. 9.]

Universalism: Blessed are the quarrelsome, for they shall be called the children of God!

25. Bible: "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." [Math. 5. 10.]

Universalism: Blessed are those who persecute the righteous, for theirs is the kingdom of glory!

26. Bible: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." [Math. 5. 8.]

Universalism: Blessed are the impure in heart, for they shall see God, as certain as fate!

27. Bible: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God." [Rom. 8. 28.]

Universalism: And *we* know that all things will work together (and be overruled) for good to all men, whether they love God or not!

28. Bible: "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life." (John 3. 36.)

Universalism: He that believeth not the Son, shall see eternal life, no mistake about it!

29. Bible: "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." (2 Cor. 5. 11.)

Universalism: Knowing therefore that God will save every body, we let them do just as they please!

30. Bible: "I press towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." (Phil. 3. 14.)

Universalism: I will not press towards the mark for the prize; as I am just as sure of it without *pressing*, as I am with it!

31. Bible: "But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed." (2 Pet. 2. 12.)

Universalism: These, although as natural brute beasts, are nevertheless made to be taken and saved!

32. Bible: "Blessed is the man that *endureth temptation*, for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him." (James 1. 12.)

Universalism: Blessed is the man that *does not* endure temptation, for whether he is tried or not, he shall receive a crown of life, which the Lord has promised to them that *hate* him!

33. Bible: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1. 16.)

Universalism: I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for all that are not saved by this means, will be saved by some other; and hence we are safe any how!

34. Bible: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. 10. 9.)

Universalism: If thou shalt deny with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and disbelieve in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, and even die in this condition, still thou shalt be saved!

35. Bible: "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me: and ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." [John 5. 39, 40.]

Universalism: You shall all have eternal life, whether you come unto me or not!

36. Bible: "With the merciful, thou wilt show thyself merciful." [Ps. 18. 25.]

Universalism: With the unmerciful thou wilt show thyself merciful!

37. Bible: "From men of the world which have their portion in *this life*." [Ps. 17. 14.]

Universalism: The men of the world have as great a portion in the next life as any other men!

38 Bible: "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death."—[Prov. 14. 32.]

Universalism: The righteous have no more hope in his death, than the wicked, that is, if the wicked only understand Universalism, for all are equally safe after they die!

39. Bible "When the wicked spring up as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyed forever." [Ps. 22. 7.]

Universalism: When the wicked spring up as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish; it is that they may be saved forever!

40. Bible: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God." [Ps. 9. 17.]

Universalism: The wicked shall be turned into *heaven* with all the nations that forget God!

41. Bible: "He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that *without remedy*." (Prov. 29. 1.)

Universalism: He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be saved, and that without injury. Or, if he be destroyed in his sins, it is not without remedy, for the resurrection will prove an effectual panacea!

42. Bible: "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace." [Ps. 37. 37.]

Universalism: Mark the imperfect man, and behold the downright ruffian, for the *end* of that man is peace!

43. Bible: "But the transgressors shall be destroyed together; the end of the wicked shall be cut off." (Ps. 37. 38.)

Universalism: But the transgressors shall be saved together; the end of the wicked shall be eternal life!

44. Bible: "Precious in the sight of the Lord, is the death of his saints." (Ps. 116. 15.)

Universalism: Precious in the sight of the Lord, is the death of his sinners; for they are all his, and will be saved together: hence the death of sinners, is equally as precious in the sight of the Lord, as the death of saints!

45. Bible: "To him that ordereth his conversation aright, will I show the salvation of God." (Ps. 50. 23.)

Universalism: To him that does not order his conversation at all, or that orders it wrong, will I show the salvation of God!

46. Bible: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." (Rom. 10. 13.)

Universalism: They shall be saved, whether they call upon the Lord or not!

47. Bible: "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." (1 Cor. 1. 21.)

Universalism: It will please God without preaching, to save them that do not believe!

48. Bible: "Whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins." (Ac. 10. 43.)

Universalism: All mankind shall ultimately have remission of sins, whether they believe on Christ or not! For they are all to be saved, and they can't be saved in their sins!

49. Bible: "In every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Ac. 10. 35.)

Universalism: In every nation, he that feareth not God, and worketh unrighteousness, is accepted with him!

50. Bible: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Rom. 5. 14.)

Universalism: As many as are led by the spirit of *Diabolas*, they are also the sons of God!

51. Bible: "Come unto me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." (Math. 11. 28.)

Universalism: Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, or stay away from me, which ever you please, and I will give you rest!

52. Bible: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, and ye shall find rest to your souls." (Ibid. 29.)

Universalism: You shall find rest to your souls, if you never learn of Christ, and if you utterly refuse to take his yoke upon you!

53. Bible: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." (Ac. 2. 38.)

Universalism: You shall have remission of sins without repentance, baptism, or any act of obedience whatever!

54. Bible: "What must I do to be saved?" (Ac. 16. 30.)

Universalism: Answer: Nothing sir!

55. Bible: "Are there FEW that be saved?" (Luke 13. 23.)

Universalism: Answer: Not a few, but ALL!

56. Bible: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" (1 Cor. 6. 9.)

Universalism: Answer: No, I did not know it!

57. Bible: "What is a man advantaged, if he should gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?" (Luke 9. 25.)

Universalism: Answer: He would be cast into heaven, and there he would find himself, so that it would be a great advantage in the outcome, for a man to lose himself and be cast away!

58. Bible: "Good Master: what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" (Math. 19. 16.)

Universalism: No good thing at all; you shall have it any how!

59. Bible: "What shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" (1 Pet. 4. 17.)

Universalism: Answer: Their end shall be everlasting salvation!

60. Bible: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" (Matthew 16. 26.)

Universalism: Answer: He shall gain his own soul back again; and get immortality and eternal life to boot!

61. Bible: "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" (1 Pet. 4. 18.]

Universalism: Answer: They shall appear in the presence of God, where there is fullness of joy; and at his right hand, where there are pleasures forever more!

62. Bible: "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" (Heb. 2. 3.)

Universalism: Answer: Easy enough; by slipping the *halter* around our necks, and swinging into *paradise!*

63. Bible: "Wo unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation." (Luke 6. 24.)

Universalism: Blessed are you that are rich, for you shall have an abundance of consolation in the next world, besides all you have in this!

64. Bible: "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven." (Math. 5. 12.)

Universalism: You need not rejoice, expecting a reward in heaven; for all the reward you will ever get, will be here on earth!

65. Bible: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him." (Heb. 7. 25.)

Universalism: Wherefore he is able *also* to save to the uttermost, those that *will not* come unto God, just as easily as those that will come!

66. Bible: "We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." (2 Cor. 5. 20.)

Universalism: We inform you by the authority of Christ, that if ye will not be reconciled to God, you shall be, any how; for he is going to reconcile all things unto himself, whether they are willing or not!

67. Bible: "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified."—(Rom. 2. 13.)

Universalism: The hearers of the law, the doers of the law, and the *breakers* of the law, shall all be justified together!

68. Bible: "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat." (Math. 7. 13.)

Universalism: Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leads to *glory*, and none there are, who will not go in thereat!

69. Bible: "For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come." (Heb. 13. 14.)

Universalism: Here have we no continuing city, but we shall have one to come, whether we seek for it *or not!*

70. Bible: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."—(Math. 25. 41.)

Universalism: Through this "everlasting fire," which was at the destruction of Jerusalem, the "*cursed*" the *devil and his angels*, and ALL shall depart safely into *everlasting glory!*

71. Bible: "Little children let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous." (1 John 3. 7.)

Universalism: Little children, let no man among the orthodox deceive you: he that doeth unrighteousness, shall be as certainly righteous, as though he did righteousness all his life.

72. Bible: "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." (Math. 6. 20.)

Universalism: You shall all have treasures in heaven, whether you lay up any there, or not!

73. Bible: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also, before my Father which is in heaven." (Math. 10. 32.)

Universalism: Whosoever therefore shall deny me before men, and shall die in the very act of blaspheming my name; him will I also confess as an heir of salvation, before my Father in heaven!

74. Bible: "Wherefore come out from among them saith the Lord,—and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you." (2 Cor. 6. 17.)

Universalism: Stay in among them saith the Lord, and touch all the unclean things on earth, and I will receive you as freely, as though you should abstain from all appearance of evil!

75. Bible: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts 16. 31.)

Universalism: Believe on Jo Smith, Mohammed, the devil; or believe nothing at all, and you shall be saved!

76. Bible: "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."—(Math. 6. 15.)

Universalism: If ye forgive not men their trespasses, and die with your hearts full of hatred and malice towards your fellow mortals, your heavenly Father will, notwithstanding, forgive your trespasses, or take you to heaven in your sins, one or the other; for you are bound to go there, at all hazards!

77. Bible: "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. 8. 9.)

Universalism: All men are Christ's, whether they have his Spirit or not!

78. Bible: "So then they which be of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham." (Gal. 3. 9.)

Universalism: So then they which are unbelievers, and die Atheists, are as certain of being blessed with Abraham, as the most faithful man on earth!

79. Bible: "Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." (Acts 11. 14.)

Universalism: He, and all his house could have been saved, just as well without those words as with them!

80. Bible: "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10. 10.)

Universalism: Salvation is absolutely certain without confessing with the mouth, or any other act of obedience!

81. Bible: "Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up." (Jam. 4. 10.)

Universalism: Exalt yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he will lift you up to heaven, as sure as fate!

82. Bible: "Wo unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him." (Is. 3. 11.)

Universalism: Peace unto the wicked, it shall be well with him, for the more he sins, the sooner he will get to heaven!

83. Bible: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." (Num. 23. 10.)

Universalism: The last end of the righteous is no better than the last end of the wicked! They are exactly alike!

84. Bible: "To present you holy, and unblamable, and unreprovable in his sight, *if* ye continue in the faith." (Col. 1. 23.)

Universalism: You shall all be presented holy, and unblamable, and unreprovable in the sight of God, if you deny the faith, and turn out to be worse than infidels!

85. Bible: "If a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully." (2 Tim. 2. 5.)

Universalism: All men will be crowned with immortality, if they strive unlawfully, or if they strive not at all!

86. Bible: "So run that ye may obtain." (1 Cor. 9. 24.)

Universalism: All mankind shall obtain the incorruptible crown, if they never run a step!

87. Bible: "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye cannot come." (John 8. 21.)

Universalism: You shall all die in your sins, of course, but that makes no difference, for whither I go (that is to heaven) you shall certainly come!

88. Bible: "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord." (Rev. 14. 13.)

Universalism: Blessed are the dead that die in their sins!

89. Bible: "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble." (Jam. 4. 6.)

Universalism: God will bless the proud, and give grace to the wicked!

90. Bible: "And shall utterly perish in their own corruption." (2 Pet. 2. 12.)

Universalism: They shall be eternally saved out of all their corruption, even if they die in it!

91. Bible: "Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you." (Jas. 4. 8.)

Universalism: God will draw nigh to you, whether you draw nigh to him or not!

2. Bible: "Be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless." (2 Pet. 3. 14.)

Universalism: You shall all be found of him in peace, and shall not be blamed, if you are as spotted as leopards.

3. Bible: "To declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." [Rom. 3. 26.]

Universalism: God would be unjust and cruel, did he not justify unbelievers and all, without exception!

4. Bible: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1. 9.)

Universalism: If we will not confess our sins, yet he would be unjust if he did not forgive them; and he will ultimately cleanse us from all unrighteousness, let us do the very worst we can!

5. Bible: "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." (1 Pet. 5. 6.)

Universalism: God will exalt you in due time to a seat in glory, just as much without humbling youselves as though you do; for the proud and the meek shall be saved and exalted to the same station!

6. Bible: "Shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of Spirits and live?" (Heb. 12. 9.)

Universalism: We shall all live, and that too, in endless felicity, whether we are in subjection to the Father of Spirits or not!

7. Bible: "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." (Rom. 8. 13.)

Universalism: If ye live after the flesh, God doth know that *ye shall not surely die*, and if ye through the spirit of the devil do gratify the deeds of the body, ye shall live any how!

8. Bible: "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out

their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." (Jude 13.)

Universalism: Those raging waves of the sea are rolling on towards heaven, at every heave; and to those wandering stars is reserved the blissful presence of God and the Lamb forever!

99. Bible: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure." (2 Pet. 1. 10.)

Universalism: You need give no diligence concerning your election, for that is unalterably fixed, and the whole human family are unconditionally elected for eternal life; no man therefore can make his election sure by giving diligence!

100. Bible: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophesy, and keep those things that are written therein." (Rev. 1. 3.)

Universalism: Blessed are they that *will not read*,—that *will not hear*, and that *will not keep* the commandments which are written in this book; for they shall all be made like unto the angels of God, whether they are counted worthy to obtain that world or not!

CHAPTER IX.

DEBATE ON THE PERFECTIONS AND ATTRIBUTES OF DEITY.

BETWEEN ALPHA AND OMEGA.

"CANST THOU BY SEARCHING FIND OUT GOD? CANST THOU FIND OUT THE ALMIGHTY TO PERFECTION?"—Job 11. 7.

[The following is a fair representation of the facts and arguments adduced in the discussion, which were taken down and reported, exactly as they were delivered, by the disputants. We shall express no opinion, with regard to the merits of the discussion, but let each reader decide for himself, after giving the matter a thorough examination.—A. H.]

ALPHA'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:

A question of deep and thrilling interest, is about to elicit the attention of this large and intelligent audience: "Can a Universal Salvation of Adam's race be proved from the attributes of God?" This is the question; and, as you perceive, your present speaker takes the affirmative. I profess to be an advocate for the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, irrespective of any condition to be performed in this life. I feel strong, and perfectly

fortified in the question now pending, knowing the tenableness of the ground I occupy. I take the attributes and perfections of Deity as my exclusive source of positive evidence in this controversy; not, however, giving up the direct teaching of the scriptures, in favor of universal salvation; yet I am bound to confess, that we Universalist preachers, by making every thing figurative, which appears to militate against us, have somewhat crippled and nullified our arguments from that source. For it is evident that our opponents, by adopting the same logic, can make all *our* proofs figurative, as we do *theirs;* and thus, from our own example, they may successfully defy us to prove our doctrine, had we the most positive testimony in the world!

But leaving that ground in the possession of my opponent, if he desire it, I expect to labor under no such embarrassments in the present question. I start out upon the admitted position, that God is unchangeable, the same yesterday, to-day and forever, without any variableness, or shadow of turning. This is the chief corner stone of the edifice I am about to erect; and as this is not only an axiomatic position, but one which my opponent will not dare to call in question; I feel as though I had dug deep, and laid my foundation upon a rock. I have no faith in this thing of *limitarianism;* for I believe that God is infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness. The scriptures are plain and positive upon this point, and as my friend will no doubt admit it, there is no necessity for quoting much scripture. One of the principle sins of the children of Israel in the wilderness, was, that they "limited the Holy One of Israel." [Ps. 78. 41.] Our opponents are daily guilty of committing the same sin; but we are no *limitarians.* We believe with the Saviour that "with God all things are possible." [Math. 19. 26.] Hence it is possible for God to save all men; and we shall endeavor to prove from several considerations, before we close the present investigation, that such will be the glorious result. Before taking my seat, (as I wish at present merely to introduce the discussion,) I will present one

direct, and as I think unanswerable argument, in favor of my position. God must have known before he created man what would be his destiny: and if he created him, knowing at the same time that he would be eternally lost, he must have willed his destruction, and as God's will is that all shall be saved, he must have created none therefore, only such as he knew would be saved; and if he had foreseen that any one of his intelligent creatures would be finally lost, his omnipotence could, and his benevolence therefore would, have withheld his existence! Here is my first positive argument, and I cannot see how it can be possibly met. In the mean time, I shall hear what can be said in reply.

OMEGA'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, AND RESPECTED AUDIENCE:

I feel truly the importance of the day's labor before us; and concur heartily with my friend, that this is a question of momentous importance; that is, providing I am on the right side of the question; but if my friend should succeed in proving his side to be the true ground, it is of but little consequence whether the question be debated or not; for it can be the means of saving no one, as all are as certain of salvation without this discussion, as they can be with it. But if it be demonstrated, that I occupy the correct ground, it may be the means of some persons fleeing for refuge, and laying hold on the hope set before them, who would otherwise have rested supinely, in the false security of a delusive error;—thinking that all is safe and certain, with respect to the future; and as regards the present short life, it is but little difference. Hence the importance of this day's occasion is wholly suspended upon the fact of my side of the question being correct.

I agree with my opponent with regard to the unchangeableness of God; but he will find this, I opine, a poor prop for Universalism, and may possibly be glad to take it back, before this discussion comes to a close.—He is quite liberal in dealing out the name *limitarian*,

and charging us very charitably with the sin of *limiting* the Almighty; and yet, in almost the same breath, he commences telling what God *must* do, and what he *must not* do! We shall see, doubtless, before long, who have best claims to the title *limitarian*, they or us. My friend has been so long in the habit of garbling the word of God, that he cannot debate the present question, I perceive, without garbling his attributes. He takes *power*, *wisdom*, and *goodness;* and says nothing about *justice* and *vengeance*. These five attributes should not be separated, but taken together, as they are all necessary to the harmonious operations of the moral government of God. They each have a list of names in the scriptures signifying nearly the same thing; and are frequently used by inspired writers interchangeably. When classified they stand thus:

1. POWER: To this belong '*omnipotence*,' '*might*,' '*strength*,' and '*ability!*'

2. WISDOM: —— '*knowledge*,' '*understanding*,' '*perception*,' and '*discernment!*'

3. GOODNESS: —— '*loving-kindness*,' '*mercy*,' '*long-suffering*,' '*compassion*,' '*pity*,' and '*benevolence*.'

4. JUSTICE: —— '*righteousness*,' '*equity*,' '*judgment*,' '*truth*,' and '*faithfulness*.'

5. VENGEANCE: —— '*wrath*,' '*indignation*,' '*hatred*,' '*anger*,' '*severity*,' '*jealousy*,' and '*fury*.'

This fifth list, is an entire stranger to my opponent's creed. I doubt exceedingly whether he has any faith in it, notwithstanding vengeance is more exclusively God's attribute than either of the other four; for whilst power, wisdom, goodness and justice, are attributes of God, they are, at the same time, attributes of man; and essentially necessary for him to possess in order to comply with the demands of God's law. The relation which he sustains towards God, and his fellow men, requires that he should possess to some extent the attributes of power, wisdom, goodness, and justice; but "vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." [Rom. 12. 19.] The great apostle to the Gentiles has also in the same connection, for-

bidden us to exercise this attribute in any case whatever; because God is the rightful and exclusive owner of it. I am perfectly willing that my friend should proceed with his arguments; and I have no doubt, but that I can prove a universal damnation, by the same logic he makes use of to prove the position he now assumes.

Having thus premised, I shall now take notice of the argument adduced, at the close of my friend's address. The gist of the argument is this: that God must have known before he made man, what would be his destiny; and hence, if he be finally lost, God wills his destruction; or, in other words, God must *will* or *decree* whatever he foreknows will take place! This being the real ground of my opponent, let us look at a few logical conclusions. Thus: all manner of theft, debauchery, witchcraft, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,—all kinds of fiddling, carousing, gambling, drunkenness, profanity, and even blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, are in exact accordance with the will of God; for, according to the premises assumed by my opponent, God *must* have known that all these abominations would be practiced, and hence he *must* have *willed* that such conduct should exist;—if not, why did he create those individuals, knowing that they would be guilty of such abominations? Yes, my audience, the only legitimate conclusion deducible from these premises, is: that all the covetous, proud, boasters, implacable and unmerciful,—that all blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, ungodly, profane,—truce breakers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers, manstealers, liars, drunkards, sorcerers, and those that are abominable, disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate;—the conclusion, I say, is unavoidable, that all such abhorrable and detestable characters are daily engaged in doing the good, acceptable, and perfect will of God: for, according to Alpha's argument, God must have known what would be their characters, and if he had not

designed, and *willed* such to be their conduct, his omnipotence could, and his benevolence therefore would, have prevented their existence! Christ says on one occasion: "Whosoever shall do the *will* of my *Father* in heaven, the same is my mother, and sister, and *brother*." The argument of my friend being correct, what a lovely and excellent brotherhood Jesus Christ must possess!

I shall again hear my opponent either mend up his old argument, or present a new one.

But before I take my seat, I wish to inform the audience that it is not my business, neither do I intend to take any definite position upon this mysterious and unfathomable subject. I simply wish to show my friend, that no important theory can be built, and no certain conclusion can be drawn from such an incomprehensible source as the attributes of God! It is unsafe and presumptuous, to risk so much upon such hypothetical assumptions:

ALPHA'S SECOND SPEECH.

Fellow citizens: It is well for my friend that he made the remark he did, just before taking his seat,—that he did not intend to establish any definite positions, but simply to raise difficulties and objections. This we can discover to be his object from the way he argues. But I have positions to establish, if not beyond quibble, at least beyond successful refutation; and I expect in the main, to sustain my ground, let my opponent raise as much dust as he pleases.

As regards the conclusion deduced from my premises, that God *wills* all manner of wickedness, I shall attend to that in due time, and prove that sin must exist according to the will of God, or it could not exist at all. Br. Rogers has argued that point successfully in the Pro and Con, and proved that foreknowledge and foreordination imply the same thing; and as God must have foreknown that men would practice wickedness, he must also have foreordained or decreed such to be the fact; but for no other purpose than to be overruled for

the good of the sinner. This is my faith exactly, as it is the belief of all Universalists, east and west. I know of no Universalist preacher who does not believe and preach, that God designs to overrule sin, as well as misery, for the good of the transgressor.

As I am just now upon this point, I think it best, probably, to carry the argument a little farther. The truth is, God is the author of sin; not directly, but through the agency of man, who only does what God foreknew and foreordained that he should do. This is clearly taught in the bible. The apostle declares, that "*All things* are of God." [2 Cor. 5. 18.] And the Lord himself declares by the mouth of the prophet: "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and *create evil:* I the Lord do all these things." [Is. 45. 7.] This is sufficient for the present. God is not only here declared to be the indirect author of sin, but it is here said, emphatically, "*I create evil*,"—which is *sin*, and of course one of the *all things*, which the apostle affirms to be "*of God*."—My opponent will find this an exceedingly hard argument to meet; but I presume he will try to twist along over it, in some way.

The apparent difficulty presented at the close of his speech is no difficulty at all. We have a right to reason *a priori*, from what the attributes of God are, to what they will necessarily lead him to do. This is logical, and we intend to make good use of it in this discussion. We shall now present an insurmountable argument:—God is infinite in power, wisdom and goodness. 1. His infinite *goodness* would prompt him to desire the endless happiness of the whole human race. 2. His infinite *wisdom* was sufficient to devise means adequate to bring about the end desired; and 3. His infinite *power* was sufficient to carry into effect the means which infinite wisdom had devised, so that the end prompted by infinite goodness will be attained! This argument can also be presented in another form, which will give it perhaps more force. One of three grounds must be admitted;—Either 1. God *can* save all men, but *will not*; or 2. God

will save all men, but *can not;* or 3. God *can* save all men and *will* save all men? If you take the first, and say he *can* but *will not*, you limit his goodness. If you take the second, and say he *will*, but *can not*, you limit his power; but if you prefer the third, and say he *can* and *will*, you have Universalism, the very thing for which I am contending! The whole argument in favor of universal salvation is based upon the omnipotence of God. What infinite benevolence can prompt, and infinite knowledge can devise, infinite power can carry into execution; and thus, in every way it can be turned, universal salvation is the inevitable result. But I have argued the point now, till I have got almost out of sight of my opponent, and I had better rest till he overtakes me! I wish the congregation, however, to take particular notice of the manner in which my arguments are met.

OMEGA'S SECOND REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators: In proceeding with this discussion, I have one suggestion to make, and one favor to ask, since to elicit truth, is the object for which we have convened on the present occasion. I do hope that my opponent will not present too many points in one speech. I wish to meet every argument, and my friend, no doubt, is desirous to have the whole ground fairly canvassed;—and he should know, as I presume he does, that to rebut an argument requires more time than to present it, admitting the disputants to be on equal footing. This, doubtless will be acceeded to. The audience will remember the conclusions which I deduced from his first argument—that all manner of wickedness, and abomination was according to the *will* of God. This, you perceive, he readily admits, and attempts to justify it, by the assumption, that God is the author of sin, and that every act a man performs, is in perfect accordance with the immutable decree of Jehovah. This may be strange ground to many in this audience: but, as my opponent remarked, it is the ground of all standard authors, in the Universalist ranks. Had I not read the same argument in

the Pro and Con, and some other standard works, I should have been utterly astounded, in hearing, as I conceive, such an unrighteous and pernicious sentiment, thus unblushingly advocated! But I am not at all taken by surprise. I am fully prepared, I think, for the system in its worst forms. Yes! all that men do, is according to the will of God! Christ says: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." [Math. 7. 21.] No wonder my opponent believes that all will be saved; for, according to his view, let a man do what he will, he is doing the *will* of God, and is consequently certain of the kingdom of heaven. Is it not also unaccountably strange, that my friend should reprove a man for getting drunk, as he did the other day, when he knew the man was doing the *will* of God,—the very thing that God had decreed, or foreordained, from all eternity, that he should do; and which he could no more have avoided than he could have plucked the moon from her orbit?

God had foreordained, or decreed, according to this doctrine, that Adam should eat of the forbidden fruit.—Then it follows: 1. That God acted the hypocrite with Adam, in trying to keep him from eating, when it was his *will* that he should eat. 2. That he acted the part of a cruel tyrant, in punishing Adam for doing his will. 3. That the devil was a better friend to God than he was to himself; for whilst God tried his best to keep Adam from doing his will, the devil persuaded him to do it. And, 4. That God commanded Adam not to eat, and at the same time had decreed that he should eat;—thus placing him between the horns of an unmerciful dilemma, either to break God's *command* or his *decree!*

My friend if strong in the belief, that foreknowledge and foreordination imply the same thing; or, that whenever a thing is foreknown it is decreed. We shall attend to this subject more fully by and by; but for the present we shall adduce one argument, to show that God has foreknown certain things which he had not decreed.

And in the first place, we take it for granted, that Christ, whose meet was to do the will of his Father, and to do those things that were well-pleasing in his sight, could not labor to break any of his Father's decrees; yet we have an abundance of evidence on hand, to prove that he did both desire and labor to prevent a certain transaction from taking place, which he and his father both knew would certainly come to pass, and which had been predicted by a number of the prophets. I mean the destruction of Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate." [Luke 13. 34, 35.] Thus, Christ labored to prevent Jerusalem from being destroyed, which proves that God had not decreed its destruction, although he foreknew and predicted that such would be the case.

But "God is the author of sin!" Let us examine this for a few minutes. My opponent quotes in proof of this position: "*All things are of God.*" But all what things? Not all *bad* things, certainly: but all *good* things! The same apostle asserts, that charity "*believeth all things.*" [1 Cor. 13. 7.] That is, *all true things;* for no one can suppose that charity binds a man to believe a lie! Yet, the way my friend argues, we should be led to that very conclusion. But let us see how the apostle John agrees with my opponent: "All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, *is not of the Father.*" [1 John 2. 16.] Hence, the *all things* which are of God, as I before observed, must be limited to all good things, and ergo, does not include sin. "Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." [Jam. 1. 17.] Does *sin* come down from the Father of lights? If so, is it a good and a perfect gift? "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law," [Gal. 5. 22, 23,] but no mention is made of *sin*, in

ɜt of all the fruits of the Spirit; and as sin is not of
ɔirit, it is not of God, for "God is a Spirit." [John
] But sin is a work of the flesh. "Now the works
flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, for-
on, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witch-
hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions,
ers, drunkenness, revelings, and such like: of the
I tell you before, as I have also told you in time
that they are all *of God?* Nay, verily! My op-
it says they are; but Paul says: "that they which
ch things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."
19–21.] Thus the apostle contradicts Christ, by
ing, that those who are guilty of the above conduct,
h my opponent says is according to the will of
shall not inherit the kingdom; and Christ affirms,
ıose who do the will of God are the very ones who
be admitted into it! But my opponent may urge
God is our Father, and is the author of all that we
But my bible informs me, that the father shall not
the iniquity of the son." [Ezek. 18. 20.] Yet my
wishes to throw the blame of all manner of wick-
s upon the head of our heavenly Father! We are
ned in the scriptures, that "God hath made man
ıt." [Ec. 7. 29.] Did God make man an upright
r? Again we read: "And God saw every thing
he had made, and behold it was *very good!*" [Gen.
] Is God the author of sin? If so, is sin *very good?*
can you think of any thing that is very bad?
t God says: "I make peace and *create evil.*" But
kind of evil? Not moral evil, or sin, by any means;
hysical evil, such as was threatened against Nin-
"And God saw their works, that they turned
their evil way: and God repented of the *evil* that
d said that he would do unto them, and he did it
[Jonah 3. 10.] Did God repent of the sin he was
to commit against the Ninevites? My opponent
ubts think so! But all evil, which God is said to
s, we understand to be judgments which he brings
men for their disobedience. Thus it is said: "Shall

there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" [Amos 3. 6.]

But my opponent argues, that no blame can be attached to the character of God, although the author of all the sin and misery in the universe: from the fact that he designed it for a wise and benevolent purpose, that he might overrule it for good! This is however a sheer subterfuge. If God designed to introduce sin, and then to overrule it for the good of the sinner: we may well ask: "Why doth he yet find fault?" Why does he labor so hard to get sin out of existence, since it is designed for a good end? Why does he manifest such mighty displays of wisdom, power, and goodness, to do away his own benevolent enterprise of sin? Why condemn it with such awful threatenings, and terrible denunciations if it be right, and designed to be overruled for good? Why bring such direful calamities, and such unparalleled judgments upon the children of men, for being instruments in his hand of doing that only which will result in the greatest amount of good; and which they no more could have avoided, than they could have prevented their own existence? Why say "I write unto you little children that you sin not?" when if they did sin, they were only doing the will of God,—the very thing that would be overruled for their good? Why be "angry with the wicked every day?" Why "hate all workers of iniquity?" Why have "no pleasure in wickedness?" Why, let me ask, cannot God look upon sin with the least degree of allowance, since it is his own invention, and calculated not only to add to his own glory, but to result in good to the transgressor? As *sin* is designed for a good end, and will certainly result in good and not evil, so that every sinner will be the gainer by it; why does not God command, and encourage his children to practice vice, rather than virtue? Would not a wise and benevolent earthly parent, place all the inducements possible before his children, to lead them into the path which would result in their best good? If so, would not our heavenly Father manifest more paternal regard

for his dear children, if he should encourage wickedness, with all the benevolence of his soul, rather than *curse* men for doing that which they could not help,—which was bound upon them by the immutable decree of Jehovah, and which, if wrong, no one was to blame for but God himself? I am astonished that my friend, with all his intelligence, could ever have imbibed such a doctrine. That God would make a man commit sin, and then bring down fire and brimstone upon his head, for that which he could not possibly avoid. Like the father who whipped his boy to make him drink whisky, and then whipped him for getting drunk! What would my opponent think of me if I should knock him down, and then kick him for falling? Just as much, verily, as I do of the God he professes to worship!

But the doctrine which my friend is endeavoring to inculcate, is most pernicious in its tendency, and is calculated to encourage sinners to continue in the practice of wickedness. It holds out the very strongest inducements to commit sin, whenever the doctrine is fairly understood. It is an undeniable fact, that the more God overrules for our good, the more good we will experience; and as all sin is to be overruled for our good, it follows then,—the more sin the better! Sin is preferable to virtue for several considerations: for when a man performs a virtuous act, the good resulting from it he receives as he goes along; but when he commits a sin, and is punished for it, he derives present consolation, from the consciousness that the sin he committed was according to the will and decree of God; and the anticipation of the whole matter being overruled for his good, would inspire more bliss than would over-balance the punishment he then endured; and as God inflicts no punishment now, except the compunctions of conscience, it is as clear as demonstration, that the sinner gets all the good resulting from sin, both by anticipation, and actual possession of the result, when God shall overrule it for his good, and that too, without any punishment at all; for what man's conscience *would lash him* for doing that which he could

not avoid, and which he knew to be the eternal and unchangeable *will* of God? As well might his conscience goad him for not being six feet high! From this it is most manifest that my friend's doctrine holds out a two-fold greater reward for vice than for virtue! Should a man live the most base and profligate life;—should he continually blaspheme the name of God, and trample under foot, with the most ineffable contempt, the commandments and authority of Jesus Christ; it shall all work together, and be overruled for his good! Should he wantonly and maliciously imbrue his hands in the blood of his own wife and children, my opponent would inform him, (if he should act out the principles of honesty,) that all this was according to the will of God, and that it would result in the best possible good to him, as well as to the victims of his cruelty! And should he be *hung* for the crime, God will overrule it for his good; and upon the same principle, I see no good reason why the *good* Lord might not damn him, and send him to hell for his good!

But my opponent believes that righteous men will not be rewarded for their virtuous deeds, only in this life,—the reward is never postponed till a future state. This is another demonstration, that his doctrine holds out more inducements for vice, than virtue. A man dies, in the very act of committing murder, and thus is launched into eternity, without having the murder overruled for his good; and hence, as all sin is to be overruled for the good of the sinner, it follows that this sin will be overruled for his good in eternity: and thus, whilst my friend teaches, that virtuous conduct will not benefit us in a future state, wickedness would be an eternal advantage to us by being overruled for our good! If I believed this doctrine, I should consider myself morally bound to commit all the sin I possibly could, that it might be overruled for the good of myself and others! Thus "the goodness of my God," in overruling all sin for good, instead of leading me to repentance, would lead me to continue in sin that grace might abound, and that the

goodness of God might overrule it all for my good: or if I repented at all, it would be because I had not committed more sin, that I might have more overruled for my good!

It is an absolute contradiction in terms, to say that the goodness of God will lead a man to repent of his sins; and, at the same time, lead him to commit sin, by assuring him, that the very worst thing he could do, would result in good, and would inhance his happiness for eternity! Suppose I should ask my friend, why he preaches Universalism: his answer doubtless would be, to make men happier in this life, by doing away the unnecessary and servile fear of a future hell! But if his doctrine be true, that God will overrule every thing for good, why not let them fear ahead? The more hell and damnation is preached to them, the more they will fear, and the happier they will be, when it comes to be overruled for their good! If I believed the doctrine of my friend, I would preach up endless damnation nevertheless; for it would, in the outcome, benefit those who feared it; and I would lose nothing by preaching such abominable falsehoods, (if such they be,) for they too, would be overruled for my good!

But my opponent is verily found fighting against God, in trying to do away the fear of a future hell; for God foreoredains whatsoever comes to pass; and it has come to pass somehow or other, that a very large majority of the world believe in a future hell; and hence God has foreordained or decreed it: and as God would not decree a thing that was not right, it is right, therefore, for the orthodox to believe just as they do! If my friend admits this, which he cannot avoid; then he is doing wrong whenever he opposes them; for it is most unquestionably wrong for a man to oppose that which is right. Will he argue, that God has willed and decreed, that men should fear hell and a lake of fire and brimstone, which do not and never will exist? If he has thus decreed, then it follows, that some men will eternally fear hell; for my opponent, at the commencement of this discussion, built his citadel upon the position, that God is without

variableness or shadow of turning: and hence those who are now tormented with that fear, which owes its existence alone to the decree of God, will be thus tormented to all eternity; and what will become of my friend's universal happiness and holiness? I think, from his appearance, he is getting a little ashamed of this idea of sin being overruled for good; and if I am not very much deceived, he will leave that doctrine before night. If he does not, I have an abundance more, off the same piece.

But as I have already spoken somewhat longer than I had intended, I shall again hear my opponent!

ALPHA'S THIRD SPEECH.

Fellow citizens: My opponent manifested quite an anxiety, at the commencement of his speech, that I should not present too many points; and that he wished to have sufficient time to examine thoroughly every argument I adduced. I think he has no ground for complaint, and in his next speech, he had better request me to make no arguments at all; for he has utterly failed to notice those upon which I relied in my last address, in support of universal salvation.

It is true, he examined the doctrine of God being the author of sin, and of sin being overruled for good; but did I make that a point in this discussion? By no means. I simply referred to that idea, as the only reasonable way to account for the existence of sin, and from the fact that my first argument necessarily leads to the conclusion, that sin is according to the will of God: hence the necessity of making him the author of sin, that he might overrule it for good! I was aware also of the difficulties and absurdities, that might be presented according to this ground; and am not all indebted to my opponent for the information, as I had thoughts of the same conclusions years ago. Hence, I have never argued that point very strongly, neither do I think it would be detrimental to my doctrine, if I should throw that matter up altogether, and admit that sin came into exis-

tence contrary to the will of God. But here again difficulties would stare us in the face. Let my friend first tell us, why God, who is almighty in power, did not prevent the existence of sin, if it be an evil of a positive character, (that is, one that shall not be overruled for the good of the sinner,) before he undertakes to expose the absurdities of my position. If I cannot reconcile the tendency of my doctrine, in all sin being overruled for good; neither can he account for its existence at all, so that he is as deep in the mud, as I am in the mire.

But my arguments, as I observed before, upon which I based my doctrine, have not been met, neither do I think they can be. The audience no doubt recollects them. I will however state them again, God is infinite in *power*, *wisdom*, and *goodness*. This proposition, my friend does not call in question. From this, we drew the following conclusions: 1. His infinite goodness would prompt him to desire the endless happiness of the whole human race. 2. His infinite wisdom, was sufficient to devise means, adequate to the accomplishment of the end desired; and 3. His infinite power is all-sufficient to carry into effect the means, devised by infinite wisdom; so that the end prompted by infinite goodness, will be attained! The result is Universalism!

I predicated another argument upon this same foundation, arranged in a different manner. One of three grounds must be admitted: either 1. God *can* save all men, but *will not*, or 2. God *will* save all men, but *cannot*, or 3. God *can* save all men, and *will* save all! If he should take the first, and say that God *can* but *will not*, he limits his *goodness*. If he should prefer the second, and say that God *will*, but *cannot*, he limits his *power:* but if he should choose the third, and say he *can* and *will*, he admits Universalism, the very doctrine for which I am contending. But more still: God is perfectly holy in himself, and it is not at all likely that he will permit *unholiness* eternally to exist in direct opposition to his nature! And if, as my friend argues, the Almighty has no pleasure in wickedness, will a being of infinite power

permit a thing to exist to all eternity which is opposed to his pleasure? Nay, verily! It must, it will be destroyed, as certain as "the Lord God *omnipotent* reigneth."

But my opponent says I do not believe in the attributes of justice! But I say to him, in the language of scripture: "Thou art the man." Universalists are the only men on earth who believe in the justice of God.—This I say, fearless of contradiction; and for this reason: All men originally belonged to God, and it would be unjust for him to lose any thing that is rightfully his! Would it not be unjust for the devil to drag down to everlasting destruction, those who were the legal property of God? The justice of God is infinite, and requires the universal salvation of all men; and it is not in the power of man, or the devil, to rob God, or to cheat him out of that which is justly his due. But more still: the infinite justice of God requires, that his glory should not be diminished: and if some are eternally lost, it will be curtailing that glory which is due to God alone. But as no man has power to add to, or diminish from the glory of God, it follows hence, that infinite justice must be satisfied, and the declarative glory of God sustained, by universal salvation, and nothing less! I hope the congregation will bear this argument in mind, and see what way my friend will attempt to meet it, if he attempt it at all!

He did not object to my *a priori* logic, and I presume from this, he admits it to be correct. I have accordingly reasoned from what God is, to what he must do, and Universalism is the inevitable result. Let these arguments be first replied to, and we shall be forthcoming with an abundance more. I expect he will excuse himself, as he did before, for want of time, in order, doubtless, to get rid of noticing them;—but he shall have as much time as he desires; and I hope the Moderators will put him in mind of them if he inclines to pass them by!

Before I take my seat, I wish to observe, that this discussion is not merely for the sake of victory, or who shall

get the mastery, as far at least, as I am concerned; but my sincere object is truth. And certain it is, if I am in an error at all, it is one of an exceeding dangerous character. I shall therefore give my friend a fair chance to set me straight if he can, and at the same time, I shall endeavor to observe the "golden rule," to do to him as I would like to have him do to me!

OMEGA'S THIRD REPLY.

Respected audience: There is to be more spirit and interest, I perceive, in the present discussion, than I had at first anticipated. I am glad to find my friend of such an affable turn, and to possess such an accommodating disposition. I conceive it to be worthy of a better cause than Universalism. But he has, as I predicted, given up the theory of God being the author of sin, and overruling it all for the good of the sinner. He says he had seen its absurdities years ago, and that he did not make it a point in the present discussion. But I leave it to the audience to judge, if he did not, when he introduced the argument, referring to the Pro and Con, and admit it to be the faith of all Universalists.

But he appears to have one thing to console him, and that is, (to use his own language,) that I am as deep in the mud, as he is in the mire! He tells me to account for the existence of sin, on my principles: how it is, that sin could be introduced contrary to the will of that God who is infinite in power. But it is his place to account for it, as much as mine, as it is no more my doctrine than his, since he has yielded up the other notion, and acknowledged himself in the mire; and also that it leads to *absurdities* which he had seen years ago. And as no doctrine can be true, that can be logically reduced to absurdities, he must therefore believe with me, that sin was introduced contrary to the will of God. Now let him account for it, as he understands the attributes of God so well, as to risk his salvation on a theory, which has no other foundation. I said at the commencement, and I *say so still*, that I do not profess to understand

every thing, connected with the attributes of the incomprehensible Jehovah, There is one thing, however, unavoidable, if sin came into existence contrary to the will of God, as we see must have been the fact, then no other conclusion can follow, only that God could not prevent it. But I know it is urged that all things are possible with God. This however is not true, without being qualified; for it is "impossible for God to lie," [Heb. 6. 18.] and "*He cannot deny himself.*" [2 Tim. 2. 13.] Upon the same principle, it would be impossible for God to make man a moral agent, and make him a machine at the same time, and thus only, can we account for the fact, that it was impossible for God to prevent the existence of sin.

He appears to intimate as much as that I have conceded his *a priori* logic to be correct. In this he is mistaken. I do admit, however, the true system of *a priori* reasoning, which is to draw conclusions from established premises, or to trace out effects from known causes. But the system adopted by my friend, is not to be found in any logic in christendom. Who can know the cause or the premises, from which he deduces the conclusion of universal salvation? None but God! Well may the question be propounded, "canst thou by searching find out God?" My opponent answers yes! "Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" Yes, says my friend, I can know him like a book: and one would think, from the positive manner in which he speaks of what God's attributes must do, and what they must not do, that Jehovah was nothing but a play thing in his hands! But in vain will he attempt to fathom the incomprehensible Deity. Infinity is an ocean without a shore,—a center without a circumference. All is mystery,—creation responds Amen; and echo answer *mystery!!* No more can we comprehend the infinite I AM, with finite powers of perception, than we can measure unlimited space with a ten-foot pole. We may tell what the power, wisdom, and goodness of *man* may do; for this is *within the* limits of our comprehension: but no man can

tell what the definite attributes of God will do, only from what they have done. This is the *a posteriori* system of reasoning,—the true, and the only true philosophy connected with this awfully sublime and mysterious subject; and as God, in all his judgments inflicted upon the human family, has manifested his infinite wisdom, power and goodness, in separating the righteous from the wicked,—in destroying the rebellious, and saving the godly out of temptation; it is illogical and unreasonable to infer that he will not continue to do the same. And as he does not now, in the present state of being, cause such separations and destructions of the ungodly, as he did in days of old, in follows unavoidably, that such will be the case in the future state. This must be done, as certain as God is unchangeable, a proposition which my friend says is the very chief corner-stone of the edifice he is endeavoring to erect. But a more perfectly suicidal effort, methinks, he could not have made, than to erect his cause upon the immutability of God. Look at the premises and conclusion. God has never justified the wicked; but has in all cases poured out his vengeance and indignation upon their heads, for trampling under foot his authority: but God is unchangeable,—the same yesterday, to day, and forever; therefore he will fail to do in eternity what he has always done in time!! This is the logic of Universalism.

Having now laid my foundation, I shall attend to my friend's arguments. He states his propositions thus:—1. God's infinite goodness would prompt him to desire the salvation of all mankind. 2. His infinite wisdom was sufficient to devise means adequate to its accomplishment; and 3. His infinite power was all-sufficient to carry those means into execution, so that the end, prompted by infinite goodness, will be attained! This is a correct statement of his first argument, and it shall be fairly met. But why did not my friend bring into his argument all God's attributes as well as these three? The truth is, there would have been too many strings to play the tune of Universalism! Suppose the infinite attribute of ven-

geance had been substituted in the place of goodness, it would have created the very harmony of discord with his doctrine! Let us try how that string will vibrate. 1. His infinite *vengeance* (abstract from goodness) would prompt him to desire the damnation of the whole human family. His infinite wisdom was all-sufficient to devise means adequate to bring about the end prompted by infinite vengeance; and 3. His infinite power was sufficient to carry those means into execution, so that the end prompted by infinite vengeance, which is universal damnation, would be attained! This is as sound logic as his!

But let us look at it from another angle. 1. God's infinite goodness would prompt him to desire the holiness and happiness of all men in this life. 2. His infinite wisdom was sufficient to devise means adequate to its accomplishment: and 3. His infinite power was all-sufficient to carry into execution the means devised by infinite wisdom, so that the end prompted by infinite goodness, (a present universal salvation from sin and misery,) would be attained! Thus, fellow-citizens, you discover that my opponent's logic contradicts plain matter of fact; and ergo, cannot be sound. He is compelled to take one of two grounds: either 1. That God is now in favor of universal holiness and happiness, or 2. He is opposed to it. If he choose the second, then God will always be opposed to universal holiness and happiness; for (mark the fact!) he is without variableness or shadow of turning! But if he prefer the first, and say that God is now in favor of present holiness and happiness, then let him give us the reason why all are not now holy and happy! The very reason he will assign, why all are not now holy and happy, I will also assign, why all will not be holy and happy in the future state! Will he tell us that God's goodness is now deficient? Then he will never be any better, unless he is changeable; and consequently those whom his infinite goodness will not now save, will remain unsaved eternally! But will he take the ground that his wisdom is at fault? If so, then those

who fail to be saved now, will be lost forever; for God is now as wise as he ever will be! But will he take the ground that the *power* of God is lacking, and that this is the reason why all are not now saved? If so, then it follows that *infinite power* is not strong enough to save some men here; and as nothing stronger than infinite power can be expected in eternity, it is incontrovertibly evident, that such men cannot be saved there! But should he, in the last place, take the position, that God's wisdom, power, and goodness, are as perfect, and as much in favor of universal holiness and happiness now, as they ever will be, but that the fault is all on the part of man; then it follows, that man, as a moral agent, has power to frustrate a plan, prompted by infinite goodness, devised by infinite wisdom, and which infinite power was about to carry into execution; and also, that God exercises his attributes with regard to man's salvation, only in such a manner as will comport with man's moral agency, as a being subject to moral government! This latter is unquestionably the true ground, and of course operates as much against universal salvation at one time, as another!

But the same argument, to which we have now replied, was presented in a different form. Thus: One of three grounds must be admitted: either 1. God can save all men, but will not; or 2. God will save all men, but cannot; or 3. God can save all men, and will save all. If you admit the first, and say he *can*, but *will* not: you admit his power, but limit his goodness. If you admit the second, and say he will, but cannot: you admit his goodness but limit his power. But if you choose the third, and say he *will* and *can*, you admit Universalism! Here, then, is the argument, and my opponent, no doubt, thinks it unanswerable. But if his mind is just as lop-sided, as this argument, I am not at all surprised that he should believe Universalism, or any other dogma that would happen to get on the upper-hill-side of his intellect!

One of three grounds must be admitted: either 1.

God can damn all men, but will not; or 2. God will damn all men, but cannot; or 3. God can damn all men, and will damn all? If my opponent should admit the first, and say that God can but will not, he grants him power but denies his vengeance. If he admit the second, and say he will, but cannot, he grants him vengeance, but denies his power: but if he admit the third; and say he *will* and *can*, he will have universal damnation, or his own logic is good for nothing!

But this can also be disposed of, by bringing it along side of facts as they now exist. Let us try it.—One of three grounds must be admitted: either 1. God can save all men from sin in the present life, but will not: or 2. He will save all men, but cannot: or 3. He can save all men in the present life, and will save all! If my friend admit the first, and say he can, but will not; he grants the almighty power but denies his goodness. If he prefer the second; and say he will, but cannot; he admits his goodness, but denies his power: but if he adopt the third, and say he can and will save all in the present life, he will say that which every one knows to be false! Here, then, goes his *ad captandum* logic by the board, and let him gather up the fragments if he can!

After all my friend's reasoning and philosophy, he finds the stubborn fact of present sin and misery, (and that too, as he has to admit, contrary to the will of God,) staring him continually in the face; and as long as his hypothetical speculations contradict known and acknowledged matters of fact, the whole scheme must be considered sophistical and false. Notwithstanding before ever God created the earth, his wisdom, power, and goodness, were just as infinite as they are now, or ever will be; and yet, for all this, sin and all its concomitant woes were introduced into existence. This being the fact, it must either have been according to God's will, or against it. If we say against his will, then it may continue against his will to all eternity; for his will can be no stronger at one time than at another. But if we say according to his express will and decree, then sin and

ry will eternally exist, as God is unchangeable! It be a difficult task for any man to prove, that God, is without variableness or shadow of turning, will ary, and so turn, as to decree out of existence, that ch exists alone by the good pleasure of his counsel! angels in heaven might have been cheated by this system of logic, had my opponent been there, be- the earth was created! The angel Gabriel comes im, and informs him, that the Almighty was about to te a world, and to people it with a race of beings, , he predicted, would sin against God, and thereby duce sorrow, sighing, sickness, and death: and that e than *eighteen hundred millions* of those intelligent gs, whom God was about to create in his own image, ld fall in the field of battle,—would hew each other ieces with the sword,—would burn each other at the e, and roast them alive,—would commit each other ie dens of ferocious animals, to be furiously torn in es, and that the earth was to be no better than a ghter-house,—a valley of carnage and blood-shed for housand years! No! no, (says my opponent,) Ga- , you are deceived upon this subject: in thinking, the Almighty is a being who would permit such an mous amount of sin and suffering to come into ex- ice. I can demonstrate from the attributes and ections of God, that you are a false prophet, and that a disastrous result can never occur in all the uni- e of created intelligences. One of three grounds you t admit: either 1. God *could* prevent such a state of gs from coming into existence, but *will not;* or 2. would prevent it, but cannot; or 3. He *can* and *will* ent it. If you choose the first ground, Gabriel, and that God *can* prevent such a state of things, but *will* you limit his goodness, which all the angels in heaven w to be infinite. If you adopt the second ground, and that God *would* prevent all that suffering, but *cannot*, admit his goodness, but limit his power, which is too ird to be admitted for a minute. But if you prefer third ground, and say that God *can* prevent such a

state of things, and *will* prevent it, you not only allow the attributes of God to exist, in infinite fullness and perfection; but you give up your cruel dogma, of sin and misery, and admit that universal love, joy, and peace will be the ruling, and predominant principle, in that beautiful world which the Almighty is about to create!! At such profound reasoning, and astonishing powers of intellect, that mighty seraph would doubtless have yielded the point, and remained firm in the faith of universal holiness and happiness, until facts to the contrary had stared him in the face! Such too, may be the condition of my opponent, should he continue in his present faith till the great and terrible day of the Lord!

But I am not yet done with this subject, as I intend fully to explode this new system of *a priori* logic, before I take my seat; since my opponent offers me all the time I desire, and wishes me to set him straight, if I find him crooked!

The assumption that the nature of God, because he is perfectly holy, will not permit sin and misery to exist in the future state, is as baseless as a castle built in the air. Sin and misery are either opposed to the nature of God now or they are not. If they are not, then they never will be, for his nature changes not; and consequently they will always exist. But if sin and misery are now opposed to the nature of God, this proves that they may exist notwithstanding God's nature is opposed to them! And if they can exist six thousand years contrary to the nature of God, they may, on the same principle, exist eternally, for all the nature of God has to do with the matter. But as sin and misery do now exist, and that too, in opposition to the nature of God, it must be for one of two reasons; either 1. God is willing a thing should exist, in opposition to his nature, or 2. He cannot possibly prevent it. If we admit the first, then God will always be willing for wickedness to exist in opposition to his nature, (for he is unchangeable,) and will consequently be eternally opposed to himself! But if we admit the second, and say that God cannot now prevent

the existence of that which opposes his nature, then he can never prevent it, for he is as wise and as powerful now as he ever will be.

Because God has no *pleasure* in wickedness, my opponent thinks he will certainly destroy it, and that it cannot possibly exist to all eternity. But the arguments relative to sin being opposed to the nature of God, will apply equally to this case. But if, as my friend thinks, God will absolutely destroy out of existence that in which he has no pleasure, then it proves the utter destruction of some men, as well as wickedness, for it is written concerning them: "I have *no pleasure* in you, saith the Lord." What then, according to his own logic, becomes of my opponent's universal salvation?

Again: If God ever intends to destroy sin by absolute force, why did he not put a stop to it in the garden of Eden, when he would have had much less to do, than at present, or at any future period? Or if, as my opponent argues, the whole matter relative to the destruction of sin, depends upon the *omnipotence* of God, why did he not act consistently, and exert this attribute in putting a veto upon the power of the devil, and thus have prevented the existence of sin altogether? And as God did not prevent the existence of sin by absolute force, it was either because he *could not* or *would not*. If you say because he *would not*, then sin will eternally exist, for my opponent will tell you, as he has already done, that the *will* of the immutable God cannot change. But if you say, that God did not prevent the existence of sin, from the fact that he *could not*, then it follows that infinite power (consistent with the moral agency of man, and the moral government of God) could not prevent its existence; and as nothing stronger than infinite power can be expected in eternity, we can but reasonably infer, hence, that sin will exist there, as well as here! For if Almighty power was not strong enough to prevent the existence of sin, how can it be proved that the same power will cause it to cease, after obtaining the foot-hold it has? Any one can see, that it would be much easier

to prevent that mighty rock from starting down the hill, than to put a check upon it, after it gets under headway!! So much for the existence of sin.

But still my friend thinks that the attributes of God are in favor of a future universal salvation. Granted: but no more so, than they are in favor of a present universal salvation. This I have hinted at before. If, however, God's infinite goodness wills the present salvation of all men, which it certainly does;—if his infinite wisdom has devised the best possible plan for its accomplishment, which it certainly has; and if infinite power has been exerted to its utmost extent to put that plan into execution, which is most unquestionably the case; why then are not all men saved? One of two answers must be given: either God is to blame for the failure, or else the fault is on the part of man. If we say God is to blame, then he will always be to blame, for he is without variableness or shadow of turning, and hence, all men will never be saved! But if we say the fault is on the part of man, then this admission proves that God exerts his attributes, with reference to man's salvation only in such a manner as will comport with man, as a moral responsible agent. And if man, acting upon the principle of moral agency, can frustrate the plan of God with regard to his present salvation, even when that plan was brought into operation, by his infinite goodness, wisdom, and power combined; can he not then, I ask, on the same principle, and acting upon the same moral agency, frustrate the same plan also, with regard to his eternal salvation? God either intends to save all men by absolute force, or else their salvation depends upon their own conduct. If the latter, then it is conditional; but if the former, why does he not act consistently, and save them all at once, and have done with it?—As he does not now save men by the bare exercise of absolute power, it is either because this is not his way of saving men; or else he is perfectly willing that some men should remain guilty, and condemned. If the latter, then they will always remain guilty and condemned, as

certain as God is immutable; but if absolute power be not God's way of saving men, then all arguments, based upon the omnipotence of God, with reference to man's salvation, are of no avail! But finally; if God's attributes ever save the wicked, whom they fail to save here in time, it cannot be till his attributes get stronger, or till wicked men reform and get better. If they are not saved till God's attributes get *stronger*, then they will remain eternally lost, for my opponent boasts of the proposition that God is unchangeable. But to take the ground that the wicked must reform and get better before the attributes of God can effect their salvation, is to renounce Universalism, by admitting the eternal destiny of man to be suspended upon his own conduct!! Thus my opponent is cornered and hemmed in, until escape from the foregoing doubled and twisted dilemmas, and trilemmas, is rendered, I conceive, utterly hopeless!

There are some other things I had intended to take notice of in this speech, but I perceive, from the appearance of the audience, that some are getting anxious to hear the opposite side. I shall for the present, therefore, desist.

ALPHA'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Fellow-citizens: Your attention has been invited, for a considerable length of time, to the arguments of my opponent. There has been considerable ingenuity manifested, I admit; but I am glad the audience have the power to discriminate between real argument and sophistry. His effort during his whole speech, has been, as any one can see, not so much to elicit truth, as to assail my *a priori* logic. How he has succeeded, the audience, of course, will judge for themselves, let me say what I would. I have no disposition, neither should I take time if I had, to follow him through all his whys and wherefores, dilemmas and trilemmas, &c., &c., for this would not only be calling my attention from my regular congeries of arguments which I intend to present in this discussion, but it would also be laying a tax upon

the patience of my audience, which I, by no means, would feel justifiable in demanding, and to which, doubtless, they would not submit.

The principal argument in my last speech, which was predicated upon the justice of God, has not so much as been noticed. I proved, as the audience will recollect, that God's justice demands the salvation of all men, and that neither man nor the devil can cheat him out of that which justly belongs to him. I showed, also, that his glory could not be diminished, and that the declarative glory of God demands universal holiness and obedience! Will this demand ever be satisfied? But where is the justice of endless damnation! It is a solemn farce; and the God of orthodoxy is a cruel and vindictive tyrant, rather than a God of justice! He may ask me why God permits men to suffer at all? I answer, that they may know how to appreciate happiness! It is only by contrast that we can know when we are happy; and we could not enjoy the pleasure of holiness and purity, had we never committed sin! This accounts, also, for the present existence of sin and suffering.

My opponent's arguments from first, to last, are predicated upon the assumption, that man is a moral agent; or, in other words, that he is in possession of a free will! This is one of the greatest errors of the present age.—The doctrine of free agency is argued at full length, in the Pro and Con of Universalism, by brother Rogers: and we are all compelled to come to the same conclusion he did, namely: that the notion of a free will is nothing but a chimera! Hence, whatever we are to do, as involuntary instruments in the hands of God, we will certainly and inevitably do, and the idea of *volition*, *choosing*, *refusing*, etc., are all out of the question. Man acts, only as he is acted upon, by decree, by motive, or some other moving cause! Where, then, is the justice or propriety of eternal punishment?

I will here introduce an argument, which, if correct, will shiver my friend's doctrine to atoms. I refer to the true and scriptural design of punishment, which is every

where in the bible proved to be for the express benefit of the punished. God chastises for no other purpose than for our good,—in order to a reformation. This I shall abundantly prove hereafter; but, I have only time here to introduce the matter for further consideration.

I will now offer another argument, and carry it out legitimately, which is of itself sufficient to establish Universalism without the assistance of any other. It is predicated upon the acknowledged position that "GOD IS LOVE!" I intend here to borrow the language of this argument, principally from brother Skinner, in his debate with A. Campbell. I am not at all ashamed to borrow from that source, as it is the best upon that subject I have ever heard!

God is infinitely good. David says: "The Lord is good unto all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." [Ps. 145. 9.] Solomon says: "Thou lovest all the things that are, and abhorest nothing which thou hast made; for never wouldst thou have made any thing to have hated it." Christ says: "There is none good but one, that is God." [Mark 10. 18.] John says: "God is love." [1 John 4. 8, 16.] Thus the very essence, the whole nature of God, is benevolence, goodness, or love. Dr. A. Clark has well remarked: "God is never said in the scriptures to be justice, or patience, or holiness; but he is frequently, in one form or other, said to be love." When, therefore, we say, God is infinitely wise, powerful, just, merciful, &c., we do but say: Love is infinitely wise, powerful, just, merciful, &c., these being but the modifications and attributes of infinite love. When we say, all are created, controlled, governed and disposed by God, we do but say: Love creates, controls, governs and disposes of all. The goodness or love of God being coeval, and coextensive with his wisdom, and even with his existence, must extend to every being he has ever created, and attend that being through every period of his existence. If there be in the universe of intelligences a solitary being to whom God is not good, then his benevolence, being limited to less than the whole, is

not infinite. But as all allow that his goodness is infinite, no other legitimate conclusion can follow, but that his love extends to every being he has ever created!—When we say God is omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent, it is but the omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence of infinite love. And as love is omnipresent, we cannot go therefore where infinite love does not exist. No man can go beyond, or get out of the reach of, infinite goodness. All mankind, not excepting saints nor sinners,—every intelligent creature throughout the vast and unbounded empire of Jehovah, are forever surrounded, encircled, upheld, above, around, beneath, in life, in death, in time present, and time to come, by Almighty, and infinite goodness, and by all pervading, and omnipresent *love!* Moreover, God being love, he cannot exist aside from his nature; and if God should ever cease to love the sinner, that moment he ceases to be God, for God is love! From all this I draw the unavoidable conclusion: universal salvation! Can my opponent dispose of this argument? I am perfectly willing he should try it; and will therefore take my seat, without introducing any other matter, to call his attention from this, for fear he will have some excuse for not taking it up.

OMEGA'S FOURTH REPLY.

Respected audience: I know not why it is, that my worthy friend is almost in every speech insinuating, that I will feign some excuse, for getting rid of grappling with his arguments: I have felt no such disposition, and am perfectly willing the people should judge for themselves, whether I do or do not come up to the work. Whilst this last argument is fresh in your minds I will examine into its merits. But, in the first place, I will offset it, by giving another, built upon the same principle.

God is infinite in vengeance. Paul says, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." (Rom. 12. 19.) David says, "Kiss the son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a

a little." (Ps. 2. 12.) The apostle says, "Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man." (Rom. 2. 9.) "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." [Heb. 10. 31.] And finally says Paul: "Our God is a consuming fire." (Heb. 12. 39.) Thus the very essence, the whole nature of God, is indignation, vengeance, or a consuming fire. God is never said in the scriptures to be justice, or patience, or holiness; but he is frequently in one form or other, said to be a consuming fire. When therefore we say, God is infinitely wise, jealous, powerful, and just, we do but say that a consuming fire is infinitely wise, jealous, powerful, and just,—these being but modifications and attributes of infinite vengeance. When we say all are created, controlled, governed and disposed by God; we do but say, that a consuming fire creates, controls, governs, and disposes of all. The indignation or vengeance of God, being co-eval and co-extensive with his wisdom, and even with his existence, must extend to every being he has ever created, and attend that being through every period of his existence. If there be in the universe of intelligences a solitary being to whom God is not angry; then his vengeance, being limited to less than the whole, is not infinite. But as all must allow that his vengeance is infinite, no other legitimate conclusion can follow, but that his vengeance extends to every creature he has ever created! When we say God is omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent; it is but the omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence of an infinite consuming fire. And as God is a consuming fire, and at the same time omnipresent, we cannot go, therefore, where infinite vengeance does not exist. No man can go beyond, or get out of the reach of infinite wrath. All mankind, not excepting saints nor sinners,—every intelligent creature, throughout the vast and unbounded dominions of Jehovah, are forever surrounded, encircled, upheld, above, around, beneath, in life, in death, in time present, and time to come, by Almighty and infinite vengeance; and by an all pervading, and omnipres-

ent consuming fire? Moreover God being a consuming fire, he cannot exist aside from his nature; and if he should ever cease to burn the sinner, that moment he ceases to be God, for God is a consuming fire! From all this I draw the logical and unavoidable conclusion,—*universal damnation!*

I might leave the matter here, as being satisfactorily met and set aside; but I have a few remarks to make upon this declaration—"God is love." The truth is, neither *love*, nor *consuming fire* is the nature of God; but they are each his character towards men under different circumstances. *Truth* and *holiness* form the very essence and nature of God. Hence, the Spirit of God, is called the "Spirit of *holiness*," [Rom. 1. 4,] and the "Spirit of *truth*;" [John 15. 26,] but it is never called the Spirit of *love*. But let us inquire, if the fact, that God is *love*, will prove universal salvation, admitting *love* to be his nature. Not exactly: for the text speaks of him in the present tense: "God IS love," not, *will be* love at the resurrection: but he *is* as much *love* now, as he ever will be; and he is just as omnipresent now, as he ever will be; and yet, notwithstanding all this, sinners can live in the midst of this infinite, and omnipresent love, guilty, miserable, and condemned; and finally die in their sins, and go into eternity, a monument of corruption, dissipation, and depravity, and all the time too, enveloped and encircled in the embraces of infinite love! The proposition that God is love does not appear to help the cause of my opponent, any more, than if God was something else: for, if men can be guilty, miserable, and damned, threescore and ten years, and all the time surrounded with omnipresent and infinite love, they may, on the same principle, be damned to all eternity, notwithstanding this infinite love; and more than that, they actually will be, as certain as God is *immutable!* God is not however omnipresent, in the sense in which he is love, any more than omnipresent in the sense in which he is a consuming fire.

I remarked a minute ago, that these phrases repre-

sent the character of God towards men in different relations, or under different circumstances. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," [2 Cor. 5. 19,] and in this sense only are we to understand the proposition: "God is love." Those who are in Christ, are in love; for the apostle informs us that the love of God "is in Christ Jesus our Lord." [Rom. 8. 39.] If the love of God was omnipresent, or if God was omnipresent in the sense in which he is love, then there would be no such a thing possible, as getting out of the love of God: and this being true, there would be no sense in the apostle's injunction: "Keep yourselves in the love of God," [Ju. 21,] for let a man do the very worst he could, he would still be in the love of God, and could not possibly get out! But those who were out of Christ, the apostle says, are without hope, and "without God in the world," [Eph. 2. 12,] that is, they are without God, in the sense in which he is love! But in the verse preceding this proof-text, the apostle shows that God is not omnipresent in the sense in which he is here speaking, for he says: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and *he in God;*" [Verse 15,] and if God was omnipresent in this sense, he would dwell in God, whether he confessed that Jesus was the Christ or not! And in the very verse, where this proof-text occurs, the apostle pointedly teaches, that God is not omnipresent, in the sense in which he is love. "God is love, and he that dwelleth in *love*, dwelleth in God." [Verse 16.] Do all men dwell in love? How about those that are "*haters of God?*" [Rom. 1. 30.] Do they dwell in love? If not, then they do not dwell in God, and hence God, in this sense, is not omnipresent; and all the argument of my opponent upon this text, is not worth a straw!

I shall now attend to my friend's argument, based upon the justice of God. He was mistaken when he said that I charged him with denying the attribute of justice. I did say, however, that he had no faith in the attribute of vengeance; and his arguments so far, have proved the assertion to be correct; for he has not as yet noticed it,

although I have repeatedly made it a point in this discussion.

He thinks that the justice of God requires universal salvation. I grant it. But, says he, God cannot be cheated, or wronged out of any thing that is justly his due. I deny it. The service of all men in this life, justly and rightfully belongs to God; yet hundreds and thousands serve the devil with all their might as long as they live! Now one of two things my opponent is compelled to admit: either, that God is unjustly wronged, or cheated out of the service of those who serve the devil; or, that the devil has a perfect right to it! If he says that God is wronged out of their service, in this world, then he may be wronged out of their service in the next world also, and to all eternity! But if he prefer the ground, that the devil has a just right to their services in this world, he may on the same principle hold on to his claim in the next! Truth is, the justice of God just as much demands the salvation of all men here, as hereafter; and if man or the devil can violate those claims here, they can also be violated in the world to come!

But he still argues, that the ultimate glory of God requires universal salvation, and that his glory cannot be diminished. But here again he errs, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. Is not the salvation of all men as necessary, and desirable at one time as another? If so, would it not just as much enhance the declarative glory of God, for all men to be saved in time as in eternity? Most assuredly: yet all men are not saved, and consequently God's glory comes *minus* so much. My friend appears to be entirely ignorant of the fact, that men can add to, or diminish from the glory of God, by their conduct here in time. Paul, in describing the character of the world, before the first advent of Christ, gives us to understand, that "all had sinned and *come short* of the glory of God." [Rom. 3. 23.] In another place he enjoins: "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." [1 Cor. 10. 31.] Thus we may come short of the glory of God, by serving the devil, and thus diminish his glory;

or we may add to, or enhance his glory, by acknowledging his authority in all our words and actions. Now if man has it in his power, to diminish the glory of God, to the amount of the worth of his own salvation and services, for the term of three score and ten years, may he not also, on the same principle, diminish the same amount forever?

But where is the justice, my opponent asks, in endless damnation? Before he asks this question, let him compute by figures, and tell the enormity of one sin committed against an infinite God, and the exact amount of *heinousness* attached to a whole life time, spent in rebellion against Jehovah; and then let him make an estimate, and report to this audience the exact amount of punishment necessary to satisfy the demands of infinite justice! Let this all be done, before he talks of injustice, and cruelty.

But he argues that man is not a moral, responsible agent; and that consequently he is not to blame, for his conduct, in the least! Yet he contends that God has, and does punish men severely for their sins: where then, permit me to ask, is the justice of this? Can my opponent justify the character of God, in such a course of conduct? First make man a mere machine,—to act, only as he is acted upon:—second, decree that he should commit sin, which he is compelled to commit, and which he is no more to blame for, than for being created, or than the wagon-wheel for turning, when the horses move; and in the third place, lay the blame all on poor innocent, unoffending man; the victim of his vindictive cruelty, and beat him with many stripes, for nothing under the heavens, but for doing that which he could not possibly have avoided? Talking of a God of cruelty,—a vindictive Tyrant—comes with an exceeding poor grace from one who believes with my friend? But he may endeavor to save appearances, by the plea, that God will not, according to his doctrine, inflict eternal punishment. But it is a principle estsblished, not only in the ordinary affairs of life, but also in the bible, that he who will be unjust in

little will also be unjust in much! And as the God of Universalism punishes one innocent man, and that too unjustly, of course, he may, on the same principle, punish all innocent men unjustly, and that too with endless damnation, which is only an extension of the same cruel principle! None therefore, according to my opponent's doctrine, are safe under the control of the Almighty!

But my friend urges, that it is necesessary for men to be sinful and miserable, in order that they may appreciate holiness and happiness! This doctrine of contrast, will get him into a difficulty, I fear, of which he was not at all aware. In the first place, it holds out the strongest conceivable motives to prompt men to commit sin. The more a man sins, the greater will be the contrast, and of course, the more happiness he will enjoy when he becomes holy; and he shall certainly be made holy, no mistake about it, let him do the very worst he can! But, says my friend, the more he will be punished too! So much the better; for, the greater will be the contrast, and he will consequently be the happier, when the punishment ceases. The base and profligate drunkard, would delight to lay up treasures in heaven in this way, and would swallow down my friend's doctrine with greediness. Yes, the drunker he can get, the sweeter will be his holiness, when he wakes up sober in heaven! And if he should happen to get punished, by having his heel bruised, or his head broken in some of his drunken frolics, yet he has all assurance from the doctrine of my opponent, that it will work out for him a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory! That dissipated wretch, under the conviction that this doctrine is true, and with the glorious anticipation which it inspires in his bloated soul, could bear with the patience of Job, all his bangs and bruises, with the absolute certainty of being so much the happier when it was all over with! Like the man who beat his shin with a stick, that it might feel tho better when it was done hurting! My opponent told us a while ago, that the reason why he preached against orthodoxy, was to do away the tormenting fear of hell!

But why does he not act consistently, and let them be tormented with the fear of hell as much as possible, that the contrast may be so much the greater, and their bliss so much the sweeter, when they come to find out their mistake!

But there is another difficulty attending this doctrine of contrast, and that is this. Those abominable characters, after being in heaven a few thousand years, will forget how they felt when they were drunk; and will need what some folks call a memory-refresher, in order to keep up the happiness of contrast! As the Pro and Con testifies, it will be like fire, that will go out, unless occasionally renewed by fresh supplies of fuel! Hence the necessity of having a distillery in heaven, that the glory and blessedness of contrast may eternally be enjoyed!

But it is impossible, says my opponent, for any one to appreciate the bliss of holiness and purity who never committed sin. Then the holy angels of God, are undoubtedly the most unhappy beings in the universe, for they have never sinned, and I doubt very much, whether they have ever been sick: so that they are entirely destitute of the happiness of contrast! The whole creation of infants will be utterly destitute of the sweets of purity and innocence, as they have never practiced iniquity! And finally, if my opponent's doctrine be true; it is the duty of every true philanthropist to start into operation, the most successful schemes of wickedness; and to encourage the most abominable, and diabolical practices, both by precept and example, which are the best calculated to decoy men into the sinks of corruption! The more inquisitorial racks, faggots, and engines of torture are put into successful operation, against all ranks and conditions of men, the more extatic will be their bliss, when it all comes to be overruled for their good, and they get into the full fruition of the blessedness of contrast! Here then we leave this argument, and the audience can do with it as they choose. But stop, says my opponent, *they have no choice* in the matter, for they are not mor-

al agents! Sure enough! But let us look at this matter for a few minutes. I expected, since the commencement of this discussion, that the infidelity of his doctrine would leak out, and here we have it in all its native ugliness! He admitted a while ago, that sin was not according to the will of God; and that the doctrine of God decreeing sin, that he might overrule it for the good of the sinner, necessarily led to absurdities, which he had seen years ago! But now he has got back into the old *absurd* doctrine, that man is nothing but a machine, and can do nothing except what he is compelled to do by the immutable decree of Jehovah. I wonder how many times more he will back out, and back into these absurdities, before this discussion comes to a close. In denying a *free will*, or *moral agency*, he denies the whole revelation of God; for I assert, fearless of contradiction, that there is not a chapter in the bible, but that holds man as a voluntary, responsible agent,—praiseworthy, or blame-worthy as his conduct is good or bad! If the doctrine of free will, or moral agency, be not correct, then no moral responsibility can be required of man, and the idea of blame and praise is out of the question altogether. But if such a thing as volition, freedom of action, choice, blame or praise, is to be found taught in the bible, then the doctrine of my opponent is but the quintescence of Deism! Let us examine: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore *choose* life, that both thou and thy seed may live." [Deu. 30. 19.] "And Moses said unto Aaron, *choose* us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek." [Ex. 17. 9.] "Go and say unto David, thus saith the Lord, I offer thee three things: *choose* thee *one of them*, that I may do it unto thee." [2 Sam. 24. 12.] "Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me, for that they hated knowledge, and did not *choose* the fear of the *Lord*." [Prov. 1. 28, 29.] "Therefore will I number *you* to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the

slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear, but did evil before mine eyes, and did *choose* that, wherein I delighted not." [Is. 65. 12.] "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, *refused* to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; *choosing* rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." [Heb. 11. 24, 25.] So much for *choosing* and *refusing*, which is but a tithe of the testimony upon that subject. Again: "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be *blamed*." [Gal. 2. 11.] "Who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be *blameless* in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." [1 Cor. 1. 8.] "Do all things without murmurings and disputings, that ye may be *blameless* and *harmless*." [Phil. 2. 15.] "Now I *praise* you brethren that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I deliver them to you." [1 Cor. 11. 2.] "What shall I say?—Shall I *praise* you in this? I *praise you not*." [Ib. 22.] Paul asks: "Am I not *free?*" [1 Cor. 9. 1.] My opponent answers. No; you are a machine; you can move, only as you are acted upon; and you have just about as much volition as a water-wheel. Christ says: "*Freely* ye have received, *freely* give." [Math. 10. 8.] My friend says: ye can do nothing freely; for ye are all involuntary agents. Once more: "I make a decree, that all they of the people of Israel, and of the priests and Levites, in my realm, which are *minded* of their own FREE WILL to go up to Jerusalem, go up with thee." [Ezra 7. 13.] My opponent, as well as the Pro and Con, replies: God has made a decree, that no man shall have a *free will* any more than a big stone, after it gets to rolling: and that the notion of a *free will* is all a chimera!

From the foregoing testimonies we discover, that man possesses volition,—the power of *choosing* or *refusing:* that he is responsible for his actions,—that he is *blamed* when he does wrong, and *praised* when he does right, *and that he possesses a free will;* none of which can be

the case, if the doctrine, my opponent is endeavoring to inculcate, be the truth! Every phrase made use of, to express the freedom of the Almighty, in choosing and refusing, is also applied to man; and thus God himself, is proved to be a creature of fate, by the very same logic, which my opponent applies to man! Not only so, but God in the creation, has stamped a *lie* upon the conscience of every man in the universe. There is no man, in any nation, but has a consciousness of certain actions being right, and others wrong: and that he could have done differently from what he did, and will acknowledge himself to blame for doing as he did.

This all goes to stamp infidelity upon the doctrine of my opponent. But the genuineness of a doctrine, may always be known by its inevitable and necessary tendency. And if my opponent will but look at the natural tendency of his doctrine, for a few minutes, methinks he will give it to the moles and bats. Suppose he should go to the legislature of this State, and succeed in convincing that body, of the truth of his doctrine,—that man was not a moral responsible agent, and that he was not in the least accountable for his conduct, from the fact, that he was merely a machine, acting only as he is acted upon; and hence, that it was cruel to enact laws to inflict punishment of any kind upon wicked men, as they were not at all to blame for their actions. The legislature, of course, breaks open the penitentiary, and annuls all laws, relative to crime of any kind, and enacts a statute, that no man shall be punished for any offence he may commit. Suppose, in the next place, my opponent should call a general convention of all the cut-throats, horse-thieves, black-legs, murderers, robbers, gamblers, drunkards, liars, profane swearers, debauchees, scoundrels, and villains in the State, and congregate them upon some vast theatre; and then let him commence lecturing them upon his most salutary doctrine, of no responsibility, and prove to their entire conviction, that they were not to blame for any thing they *might* do,—let them murder, cheat, steal, lie, get drunk,

blaspheme the name of God, or do what they would, they had no choice in the matter,—were only doing that which God had decreed, and which they were no more to blame for, than for having an existence! And not only so, but that no human punishment should be inflicted upon them: and as for divine punishment, there was not the least danger;—their sins should all be overruled for their good: and they would only be the happier in heaven, when they come to experience the wonderful contrast that would exist. Then fancy, fellow-citizens, a thousand hungry wolves, let loose among a flock of as many sheep, and if your imaginations are sufficiently acute, you have an imperfect miniature representation of the wretchedness and devastation which would follow in the train, at the breaking up of my opponent's convention! Such is, unquestionably, the natural, and pernicious tendency, and such the inevitable and ruinous result of this dogma of fatality, wherever it obtains to the extent supposed. Having now noticed the principal arguments, in my opponent's last speech, I shall again hear what he can add in response.

ALPHA'S FIFTH SPEECH.

Fellow cititizens: It will of course be expected that I should say something in reply to the speech to which you have been listening, before proceeding with my regular congeries of propositions. My opponent has been endeavoring, during the greater part of his address, to rivet the charge of infidelity upon the cause of Universalism,—the cause for which I am contending. The congregation will just look at the charge, whilst I, in one word expose its fallacy. My opponent, as you are aware, believes that Christ will only save a part of mankind, whilst I believe in Christ as much again as he does!—This is certainly a new plan of testing infidelity! The man who believes in Christ the most is the greatest infidel! My friend looks upon Christ as a part of a Saviour: yet he is the believer, and I am the infidel! I see several gentlemen sitting back there, some of them

Calvinists, and some Armenians; and they appear to be exceedingly interested in my opponent's arguments.—Gentlemen, by your permission, I will put two of you together, and make a first rate Universalist! The Calvinist believes that Christ will save all for whom he died; and the Armenian believes that he died for all!—Hence, all will be saved! Now I will leave it to the audience to judge, whether I am an infidel, when I believe in Christ as much as both those gentlemen put together! [A laugh!]

But my opponent endeavors to justify the dogma of endless damnation; and a miserable defence he has made! He tells me to calculate the exact amount of punishment due, for sins committed against God. I will inform the audience that man is a finite being, and all his actions are like himself,—finite in their character. No man can commit an infinite offense, hence the injustice of inflicting infinite punishment. Punishment should always be proportioned to the sin for which it is inflicted; and as sin is finite, punishment must be also; actions in time can, in no case, extend in their effects into eternity! This is my doctrine exactly;—sin belongs to this life, and does not extend into the future state at all.—Hence, punishment belongs to this life, and will in no case extend into eternity. Whenever a man's body dies, then the very fountain and foundation of sin is destroyed. Sin originates in the flesh,—belongs to the flesh, and is not in the least attached to the soul, or spirit. This being incontrovertibly true, it follows, that whenever the flesh dies, the individual is free from sin. The apostle testifies the same thing. "He that is dead, is freed from sin." [Rom. 6. 7.] Hence, whenever a man leaves this fleshy, sinful state, he has nothing to do, but to regale his spirit, in the elysian fields of the paradise of God! How transcendently sublime is the faith of universal salvation!

But how mighty the contrast, between this and the soul-benumbing dogma of endless perdition. Many, in the belief of this doctrine, have become religious mani-

acs, and have gone into eternity, in the act of committing suicide! What a horrible death for any rational being to die. And look, also, at the cruel persecutions that have been conducted by the believers in that wretched doctrine. Look at the hundreds and thousands who have fallen victims to death, under the withering influence of the dogma of endless damnation. My heart is chilled when I think of the myriads who have been hurried into eternity, by the wicked and cruel doctrine of partialism. None have ever been guilty of such barbarous and outrageous conduct, except such as were believers in that heart-withering sentiment!

But my opponent is strong in the faith that those who die in their sins are lost forever! But this must lead him into a difficulty, from which he cannot possibly escape. There is no man perfectly free from sin in this life. The greatest saints die in their sins, to some extent; and consequently the whole race of Adam will be eternally lost! The only perfect freedom from sin is in the ordeal of death, when the mortal flesh,—this "body of sin, is put off."

But I will now carry out the argument on the design of punishment, introduced in my last speech. Or, at least, I will give my positive testimony upon that point, and then call upon my opponent to refute it if he can. God says to the children of Israel: "Thou shalt consider in thy heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee." [Deu. 8. 5.] Thus the chastisement of the Lord is compared with the chastisement of man; and what father, possessing the feelings that should rule in the breast of every parent, would punish his son with ceaseless perdition? But this is not all the testimony direct upon this point. The apostle Paul has placed this position beyond the reach of controversy. "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons, for what son is he,

whom the father chasteneth not? Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live? For they verily for a few days, chastened us after their own pleasure; but he *for our profit*, that we might be *partakers of his holiness!* Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous but grievous: nevertheless afterwards *it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness.*" [Heb. 12. 5–11.] This is as positive as testimony can make it, that God punishes only with regard to reformation, that the subjects of his chastisement might be partakers of his *holiness;* and he here emphatically testifies, that it is *for our profit*, and that it will yield the *peaceable fruits of righteousness!* This is the true and scriptural design of all punishment. This chastisement is not only inflicted in order to reform the sinner; but God in his benevolence places punishment before men as a motive to deter them from the commission of crime. I could present several other considerations in confirmation of this position; but I will preserve them until I hear how my friend will endeavor to evade those already adduced.—As I said before, I wish him to have all chance possible, to grapple with my testimony, and dispose of it, if he can; and if he cannot, I hope he will possess the spirit of candor and honesty, enough to confess it. He may now try his hand again, and the audience will watch the movement of the waters!

OMEGA'S FIFTH REPLY.

Fellow citizens: Were it not that my opponent would make capital of it, I would honestly confess that I know not how to dispose of his last speech; not because the arguments which it contains are unanswerable, but because it is the most perfectly heterogeneous tangleation of incongruities and contradictions that I ever heard in so short an address. If I can succeed in untwisting and disentangling its innumerable perversions, and sophistical twistifications, in three times its length, I shall have done

more than I now expect. We shall try however, to be as brief and as systematical as possible!

In the first part of his speech he endeavored to escape from the charge of infidelity, and I did not at all wonder that the audience should be diverted at the funny little twist he took! He says he believes in Christ twice as much as I do, because he believes that he will save all, and I believe he will only save a part! Hence, he concludes that I am more of an infidel than he is! Very cute indeed! But stop a little: it is just as much infidelity to believe that Christ will do, what he says he will not do, as to disbelieve every thing he says! But my opponent did not think of this! He believes that Christ *will* do what he has repeatedly said he *will not do*. I might argue, on the same principle, that I was still more of a believer than he, and contend that Christ would take all men to heaven in their sins! He would object to this, and charge me with infidelity for believing a thing which is so manifestly contradicted by reason, common sense, and the bible! But why, my dear sir, do you charge me with infidelity, when I believe in Christ so much more than you do? Look at it if you please! Neither does it follow, because I do not believe that Christ will save all, that I hold him only as a *part* of a Saviour. Suppose a physician, with medicine sufficient to cure every case of sickness that might occur, should locate in this town; and suppose a half dozen men, out of sheer negligence, or contempt for the physician, should refuse to take his medicine, and consequently die, could it with any propriety be said, that the man was only *part* of a doctor?

But my friend proved his doctrine, by putting a Calvinist and Armenian together. One believes that Christ will save all that he died for; and the other believes that Christ died for all, and hence all will be saved! This I confess, is a powerful argument!! Well: Armenianism teaches that one sin deserves endless damnation, unless this punishment be shielded off by forgiveness. Universalism teaches that forgiveness in no case shields off de-

served punishment: hence as all have sinned, if you put an Armenian and Universalist together, you have universal damnation!! Again: a Calvinist believes, that those who die in their sins will be eternally lost. My opponent affirmed in his last speech that there were none, not even the greatest saints, who did not die in their sins. Hence, put my friend and a Calvinist together, and you have a universal damnation!!! So much for that argument.

But as we are now upon this point, let us inquire into this matter of the greatest saints dying sinners! He first states such to be the fact, and in the next sentence he contradicts himself, by saying that the moment the body dies, sin is put off, and the individual is perfectly freed from it! Thus, instead of dying in his *sins*, death is nothing but a leap *out of sin* and all its contaminations into the presence of God! But this idea, that no man can be perfectly free from sin till death, is most preposterous and absurd! Cannot a man die forgiven? Certainly: if he attend to the means which God has appointed, before death. When God forgives a man's sins, is the man yet a sinner? This is truly a singular idea, that God cannot forgive a man's sins, but that there will be some sin left unforgiven! Let us hear how Paul agrees with this doctrine. "And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you *all trespasses*." [Col. 2. 13.] Suppose God should forgive a man *all trespasses*, (which he certainly would, if he forgave any,) and the man should then die, what would become of my opponent's theory? Universalists will not contend, but that Christ was perfectly pure, and died without sin! Now what says John? "When he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is: and every man that hath this hope in him, *purifieth himself*, EVEN AS HE IS PURE!" [1 John 3. 3.] But how is this to be done? John answers: "*If we confess our sins*, he is faithful and just, to *forgive us our sins*, and to *cleanse us from* ALL UNRIGHTEOUSNESS!"

[Ib. 1. 9.] Thus, if a man should confess his sins, in all sincerity of soul, before death, God would forgive "*all trespasses*,"—cleanse him from "*all unrighteousness*," and he would die uncontaminated,—"*pure, even as Christ is pure.*" Such are the characters referred to by the Revelator: "And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me write: *Blessed* are the dead that *die in the Lord;*" [Rev. 14. 13,] that is, according to my friend's logic; Blessed are the dead that *die in their sins*, for all men die in their sins, whether they die in the Lord, or out of him!! The apostle, in speaking of those ancient worthies who walked with God, says: "These all *died in faith;*" [Heb. 11. 13,] that is, they all died in their sins! What an interesting commentary my opponent could write on the New Testament, if he should once set himself about it!! Christ says: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." [John 8. 24.] Alpha says: ye shall die in your sins any how, whether you believe on Christ or not; for the greatest saints die sinners!!—Solomon says: "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord." [Prov. 17. 15.] And I would say to my opponent: "thou art the man!" He condemns the just, by saying, that the most just man that ever lived, died in his sins, and he justifies the wicked, by making out, as you have heard him do, since the commencement of this discussion, that his sins were all according to the will of God,—that he was an involuntary agent, and consequently not to blame for any thing he did, and that sin should be no injury to him in the out come, as it should be overruled for his good! Thus, as certain as Solomon has told the truth, my opponent is an abomination to the Lord, because he both justifies the wicked, and condems the just?

But another argument is presented:—Sin belongs wholly to the body, or to the flesh, and is not at all attached to the soul or spirit; and hence, when the body dies, or the flesh returns to the dust, sin ceases, as a matter of course! Let us first examine the premises, that

sin has nothing to do with the spirit, or that the spirit in the worst sinner remains uncontaminated! "Having these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all *filthiness* of the *flesh and spirit*." [2 Cor. 7. 1.] It appears from this, that the *spirit* gets contaminated by sin, as well as the flesh. "Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain? the *spirit* that dwelleth in us *lusteth to envy!*" [Jam. 4. 5.] If the *spirit* in a man *lusteth to envy*, it is sinful; "For where *envying* and strife is, there is confusion and *every evil work*." [Ib. 3. 16.] But if this should be denied, and it be contended that the lusts of the flesh are the only things that are sinful, and that they cannot affect the soul: we answer in the language of Peter: "Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from *fleshly lusts*, which *war against the soul*." [1 Pet. 2. 11.] Paul offers up a singular petitition, my opponent's doctrine being true: "I pray God, your whole *spirit*, and *soul*, and *body*, be preserved *blameless*, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." [1 Thess. 5. 23.] If there can be no blame attached to the *soul* and *spirit*, then two-thirds of the apostle's prayer was perfect nonsense! If the *spirit* cannot be unholy, why does Paul make this remark? "The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she be *holy*, both in *body* and in *spirit*." [1 Cor. 7. 34.] Solomon does not agree with my opponent, for he came to the conclusion that "the *soul* of the wicked desireth *evil*." [Prov. 21. 10.] Neither does Ezekiel: "Behold all *souls* are mine, as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the *soul* that *sinneth, it shall die*." [Ezek. 18. 4.] Neither does the prophet Micah: "Shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body, for the *sin* of my *soul?*" [Mic. 6. 7.] Such are a few of the many testimonies sustaining the position, that sin is connected with, and has its seat in the soul. Truth is, an action that does not originate in the soul, or that is not first resolved in the heart, before being carried out into practice, is not recognized by the laws of God or man, as either *good* or *evil*. The more

the spirit or soul has to do with an evil act, in premeditating, planning, resolving, etc., the more heinousness is attached to the crime. But it is most unaccountably strange, that God should inflict all punishment for sin, according to my opponent's creed, upon the spiritual part of man, the *soul*, or the *conscience*, when nothing was engaged in the practice of it except the body! Why not punish the part that is guilty? This, however, is not the only absurdity connected with this theory. My opponent believes that Christ came to save all men from sin. But he cannot save the souls or the spirits of men from sin, for they are perfectly uncontaminated, and pure from its defilements! He cannot save the body from sin; for my opponent believes, as does a majority of his brethren, and as I heard him assert last Sabbath, that the body returns to dust no more to rise. Hence, Christ is neither to save the soul nor the body from sin; and as there is nothing else to be saved, it follows that my opponent does not believe that Christ will save men from sin in any sense! But if the spirit, being separated from its polluted habitation, can be understood as a salvation from sin, then Christ coming to save men from sin, was to kill them, and separate their souls from their bodies; for my friend teaches, that no man can be freed, or saved from sin, until death! Hence, as Christ did not kill any body, but just let them die as they always had done, he did not therefore save any one from sin, and consequently came for nothing at all!

As no man can be freed from sin, until death separates his soul from his body, it is our duty therefore, to kill as many men as possible: for we are to be instruments, in the hand of God, of turning many to righteousness, and of converting our fellow creatures from sin to holiness!? If I believed the doctrine of my opponent, I should arm myself with a brace of pistols, and shoot every man I could find in the neighborhood; and I would not be ashamed of *powder* and *lead*, for it would prove the power of God unto salvation, to every one that I could bring under its influence! But says one, you might get shot as

well as the rest! Then we would all go to heaven together; for my opponent says, a man, when he dies, let him be ever so wicked, has nothing to do but to regale his happy spirit in the elysian fields of the paradise of God. Those cruel persecutors of which he spake so pathetically in his last speech, were the greatest benefactors of mankind that ever lived! Alpha said it chilled his heart to think how many myriads of men and women they had put to death, and hurried into eternity! But he should rather rejoice to think they had succeeded in making so many sinners holy and happy, by thus sending them off to heaven in droves! What a pity the apostles had not have understood this way of converting sinners! Paul succeeded admirably in this business before his conversion, but it is not recorded that he ever made a man holy, or turned one sinner to God, after he became an apostle, although that was the very object for which Christ appeared to him! The true philanthropist, under the influence of this doctrine, whenever he saw a man in trouble, or his family in distressed circumstances, would kill them and send them to heaven! This would be perfectly safe on his part, as it would be overruled for his good, and it would be conferring on them the most unspeakable blessing!

More than this; all the wicked in former times, whom God swept away with the besom of destruction, instead of being punished, were honored with the most distinguished and exalted favors, which any beings have ever yet enjoyed. God threatened the wicked antediluvians with a dreadful calamity, but he deceived himself, and them likewise; for instead of punishing them as they expected, he sent a flood upon them, and took them all through the door of death into the enjoyment of unspeakable felicity! But Noah, instead of sharing the same blessed and glorious privilege, was compelled to wander up and down this unfriendly world, three hundred and fifty years, after the wicked were safe in heaven, subject to pain and infirmity, and finally to experience the ordeal of death as much as any body else, and only get to

heaven at last! Thus the wicked had a decided advantage over Noah, and would hold it to all eternity! For there would never be a period when the wicked would not be *three hundred and fifty years* in advance of Noah, in point of celestial enjoyment!

When the Lord thought to punish the wicked Sodomites, he deceived them; for they found themselves, after one pang, transported into the beatific, and paradisical presence of God. But righteous Lot, for his unfeigned obedience to the laws of God, was debarred from the unspeakable privilege of sitting down in the kingdom of glory above: but was compelled to remain for many years, in this world of sorrow, vexation, and disappointment, whilst those filthy and detestable fellows, who had vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds, were in full possession of heavenly blessedness,—drinking of the crystal fountains of eternal love, and basking in the sunshine of immortal deliverance. Such was also the case with the hosts of Pharoah in the Red Sea; the Canaanites whom Joshua slew with a sword, and such was the case with the wicked Jews, when the Roman army was sent upon them for rejecting the Saviour, and drove them all out of this suffering, miserable, and sinful world, into the presence of God, where there is fullness of joy, and at his right hand, where there are pleasures forever more! Whilst the humble and devoted followers of Christ, instead of being taken to heaven as the wicked Jews were, had to wander in sheep-skins and goat-skins, in dens and caves of the earth,—being destitute, afflicted, and tormented;—experiencing trials of cruel mockings, and scourgings; yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, and were tortured with the most lingering and excruciating deaths that the ingenuity of men and devils could invent; whilst those wicked Jews, who were killed by the Romans, to use the language of my opponent, were regaling their happy spirits, in traversing the elysian fields of the paradise of God!!

'Thus Pharoah and his mighty hosts,
Had God-like honors given:
A pleasant breeze, brought them with ease
And took them safe to heaven!'

'So all the filthy Sodomites,
When God bade Lot retire,
Went in a trice, to paradise,
On rapid wings of fire!'

'Likewise the guilty Canaanites,
To Joshua's sword were given;
The sun stood still, that he might kill,
And pack them off to heaven!'

'God saw those villains were too bad,
To own that fruitful land;
He therefore took the rascals up,
To dwell at his right hand!'

The men who lived before the flood,
Were made to feel the rod;
They miss'd the ark, but, like a lark,
Were wash'd right up to God!

But Noah he, because you see,
Much grace to him was given;
He had to toil, and till the soil,
And work his way to heaven!

The wicked Jews, who did refuse,
The Lord's commands to do;
Were hurried strait to heaven's gate,
By Titus and his crew!

How happy is the sinner's state,
When he from earth is driven;
He knows it is his certain fate,
To go strait up to heaven!

There's Judas too, another Jew,
Whom some suppose accurs'd;
'Yet with a chord he beat his Lord,
And got to heaven first!'

My friend looks with horror upon the idea of men committing suicide. But if his doctrine be true, it is the most fortunate and blessed act they can possibly perform. But he says men have become religious maniacs from the fear of endless perdition, and have ended their existence in this wretched manner! But no man will become a religious maniac, or be led to commit suicide, if properly instructed in the religion of Christ, let hell and damnation be preached to him ever so much; for he is then told just what he has to do, in order to secure eternal life, and that there is no necessity of his going to hell, if there were five hundred of them. No man under such teaching will ever become deranged, so as to put the poisonous bowl to his mouth. But teaching men, as my opponent does, that they are creatures of fate,—that they can do nothing, only as some superior power moves them; and they, believing such to be the fact, look into the bible and see that they must do something, or be eternally lost,—this is what leads to suicide: the false and infamous dogma of fatality, amalgamated with the scriptural and restraining doctrine of eternal punishment! This is not only what leads to suicide, but the theory of my opponent—the dogma of fatality,—led to one of the most bloody persecutions that the hitsory of time records. I refer to the infidels of France, who were firm believers that man was a creature of fate; and I presume my opponent will not contend that they were stimulated to that persecution by believing in future punishment of any kind!

But suppose men, under the influence of insanity, and believing in endless perdition, should commit suicide; my friend should not let it benumb his soul, or chill his heart, as much as he let on for in his last speech. What! a soul-benumbing and horrible idea, to think, that a

man should slip off to heaven, out of this wicked and troublesome world, into the inconceivable enjoyment of perfect and endless fruition?! My opponent must possess a singular heart, to be *chilled* and *withered* at such a glorious transition, from the abodes of wretchedness to the realms of extatic bliss! But should *he* commit suicide believing as he does, so far from his being deranged, I should consider that his most sober moment, and the most rational and consistent act of his whole life! At that instant he would obey the injunction of the apostle, perhaps for the first time: "Think soberly, as you ought to think."

My friend's doctrine being true, that no man can be free from sin in this life, and that death is the ordeal of freedom, he is morally and scripturally bound to commit suicide, and it can be demonstrated beyond all controversy. He is morally bound, from the fact, that a desire for happiness is the first law of our nature; and my opponent believes that sin and misery are always inseparably connected. Hence it is a man's duty, out of love to himself, to put an end to his existence, in order to be perfectly free from sin and its consequent misery, and come into the enjoyment of perfect bliss! He is scripturally bound to commit suicide; for it is positively enjoined: "Be ye holy, for I am holy." [1 Pet. 1. 16.] Not only so, but we are commanded to "*perfect* holiness in the fear of the Lord." [2 Cor. 7. 1.] Now, since no man can become holy as God is holy, only in the article of death; and as becoming holy, or *perfecting* holiness, is here made a *personal* duty; it follows hence, that death is a *personal* duty, and that *suicide* is one of the greatest, most positive, and most sublime injunctions of the bible!

But my friend quotes the text: "He that is dead is freed from sin," and applies it to a natural death, or the death of the body. Permit me to adopt the same method of quoting and applying the word, and he will tell us no more about the horrible idea of *suicide!* Christ says: "I lay down my life that I might take it again; *no man*

taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." Peter says: "*Christ has set us an example, that we should follow in his steps.*" Hence, we must let no man take our life from us, but follow the example of our blessed Master, and lay it down of ourselves! as he says in another place: "*Except a man take his cross, and follow me; he cannot be my disciple.*" But do you say you are bound to love your present life? Not so; for Christ says: "*Except you hate your own life also, you are not worthy of me.*"

But for additional proof, in favor of suicide, listen to the invitations of the Saviour: "*Come unto me*, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, *and I will give you rest;*" and how can this be done, but by voluntarily leaving this sinful world, and going to heaven, "*where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.*" The Father also invites: "*Come out from among them*, and be ye separate, *and touch not the unclean thing*," and again: "*Come out of her, O my people*, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." And as this earth, with all it contains is unclean and sinful; and as all men are the people of God, the injunction to come out of her, is unquestionably to leave this sinful world by suicides and "*Lay hold on the hope set before you.*" And whenever you form the resolution to "*choose that good part that shall not be taken away from you*," just say with the prodigal, "*I will arise and go to my Father!*" "Look not behind you, *neither continue in all the plains.*" And as you cut the cable that binds you to earth, you will hear it said: "*Well done thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joys of thy Lord.*" Dread not the momentary pain of dying, for "*these light afflictions which are but for a moment, will work out for you a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.*" Remember: you are commanded to "*deny yourself*," and "*endure hardness as a good soldier*," with the exceeding great and precious promise: "*He that overcometh, shall not be hurt of the second death.*" Slack not your determination in this glorious enterprise, but "*add to your faith courage*,"

then "*fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life.*" And since it is most manifestly evident, that "*He that is dead is freed from sin,*" I beseech you to "*go and sin no more!*" And as you start on your heavenly journey, say with the apostle, "*Shall we continue in sin?—God forbid.*" "*To die is gain,*" and "*to depart and be with Christ is far better.*" You would thus literally "*put off the old man with his deeds,*" and "*crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts.*" The testimony of Paul would then be fulfilled, and "*Old things would pass away, and behold all things would become new.*"

Another strong reason, why my opponent should exchange this tempestuous ocean of sin and sorrow, for a world of unsullied and beatific fruition, is, that the apostles have also set us an example; and that "*we are to be followers of them, even as they were also of Christ;*" and my Universalist friends you have recorded for your special benefit, the death of one of them, namely, your beloved brother, St. Judas Iscariot, "*who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief,*" but went to heaven on a rope ladder! And the Saviour most appropriately enjoins: "*Go thou and do likewise.*" This is undoubtedly that to which the Scriptures allude: "*The kingdom of heaven suffered violence, and the violent took it by force.*" You need have no fears with regard to the expenses of the voyage, as they will be but trifling. Take six cents worth of laudanum, and a few yards of Judas's rope, to keep it down: and when "*the time of your departure is at hand,*" say to the deluded Orthodox, Good-by, gentlemen, "*I will show you my faith by my works.*" You will undoubtedly swing safely; for "*If you do these things you shall never fall,* for so an entrance shall be administered unto you abundantly, into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." But should you have any misgivings, with regard to this plan, you can get to heaven, if you prefer it, by a far shorter cut, that is, a cut from ear to ear! You will thus make sure work for eternity: and should your hand *tremble*, as the knife approaches your jugular,

let it not deter you from being consistent, as it will be a proof of your sincerity, in obeying the apostle's injunction: "*Work out your salvation with fear and trembling.*" It can then be said, "*your faith hath saved you,*" and upon your tomb-stones, shall be inscribed to your everlasting memory: "*Behold a Universalist indeed, in whom there is no guile!*"

But enough of this, I can prove any thing, and every thing from the bible, by adopting the system of quoting and applying scripture, made use of by my opponent, and his brethren generally. But if my friend should accuse me of plagiarism, and of garbling authors, I have only to admonish him in the language of an old maxim: "*Satan* should never reprove *sin!*"

But he has finally made a calculation, of the just amount of punishment, due for transgression. Sin, he tells us, is finite, and hence finite punishment, or punishment of a temporal character, is all that justice demands. He also informs us, that actions in time, cannot, in any case, effect us in eternity! But let me ask my shrude, and erudite friend, if the sufferings and death of Messiah, were not actions performed in time? and if they do not in their effects and consequences extend into, and affect us, in eternity! He will most unhesitatingly answer yes: for Universalists, as well as others, admit, that our future and endless felicity depends, entirely, as far as merit is concerned, upon the actions of Christ here in time. If such were not the case, we could well say with the apostle: *If in this life only*, we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Now if Christ's actions towards us in time, extend into eternity, and in their effects, endure forever; are not the actions of men, which caused those actions on the part of Christ, equal in duration? The audience must see that they necessarily are! My opponent is compelled to take one of two grounds, and I know not which he will prefer, either that Christ was an infinite being; or else that he was a being, finite like ourselves! If he adopt the former, it proves to a demonstration that one sin is infinite, from the fact, that it cost the life's blood of the infinite Son of

God to destroy it; and still, even this cannot be done, by this infinite remedy, without the exertion, and co-operation of the finite power of man: and consequently, if one sin is so much more than infinite, that it requires an infinite and finite exertion combined, to overcome it; how much more than infinite, would be ten thousand crimes, or a whole lifetime spent in rebellion against Jehovah? If my opponent will work this sum out by the single rule of three, and give us the answer, the audience can then judge something near correctly of the exceeding sinfulness of sin. He can state the question thus: As one sin, is to finite power over and above infinity; so are 10,000 sins to the answer!

But should he choose the second ground, that Christ was nothing but a finite being like ourselves; then it proves, that a finite being can perform a single act, which will have, not only an infinite and endless effect, but will produce that same effect in millions of cases,—all that will be eternally saved by his death! Now if one finite act, can produce effects equal to *millions of infinities;* what amount of consequence, will 10.000 finite acts produce? This sum can also be ciphered out by the same rule, and according to the same statement.

My opponent contends that punishment should always be proportioned to sin. I admit it, and hence punishment must be infinite, for, according to the foregoing argument, such is the case with sin. And it cannot be otherwise than infinite, for it is committed against the infinite God: and as certain as the infinite Jehovah is offended at the sins of men, so certain is it an infinite offense! Can an infinite God be offended, and that offense be finite? Impossible! If my opponent should take the ground, that those sins, which have "grieved," "insulted," "provoked," and "offended" the Almighty, and which make him "angry with the wicked every day," are only finite; it proves, to a demonstration, that the Almighty Jehovah is nothing but a finite being! Thus my friend is compelled to admit the transgressions of men infinite, or else deny the infinity of God. Punishment, as my opponent admits, is a motive to deter

ien from the commission of crime. Query: Is this mo-
ve held out by infinite benevolence? If so, is it an in-
nite motive? If so, must it not be infinite punishment?
t certainly must; as *finite* punishment cannot be an *infinite* motive! From this it follows that sin is an infinite evil; and this is in exact accordance with the bible: "Is not thy wickedness great, and thine *iniquities* INFINITE?" [Job 22. 5.] My opponent is compelled, on his own principles, to admit infinite punishment, for punishment and sin, he tells us, must always be in proportion with each other; and as we have positive testimony that one is infinite, the other must therefore be also.

But if sin be not infinite, where was the necessity of an infinite God bringing into requisition his infinite wisdom, power and goodness, to put a check to it! If it were only finite, it would have required only a finite cause to annul it. But it was of such a heinous character, that it caused God to exercise his infinite benevolence in sending down an infinite Saviour, who offered himself up an infinite sacrifice, to make an infinite atonement, in order to bring about an infinite system of reconciliation, that men, being redeemed from their infinite transgressions, might be made heirs to an infinite inheritance, and enjoy it forever, in the presence of the infinite God!

But if *sin* be measured by *man*, as my friend thinks it should be, still it does nothing for the doctrine he is endeavoring to advocate; for man is not finite, only as regards his mortal body. His soul or spirit is an infinite principle, and will endure as long as God himself; and as we have before proved, that sin originates, and has its seat in the soul, it must therefore be the product of an infinite principle; and if my opponent's logic be correct, that our sins are like ourselves, it is demonstration in favor of the infinity of sin! But if sin be like its author, as my friend contends, then he is bound to admit its infinity; for he has contended, since the commencement of this discussion, that the infinite God was the author of it. Hence, let him turn which way he will, there is no dodg-

ing this conclusion. He may tell me, that sins committed under the old covenant were punished only with temporal destruction, and that consequently they were only finite. But suppose we should admit, that sins committed against Moses were of a finite character: this does not settle the question with regard to sins committed against Christ! The apostle, in speaking of Christ, says: "For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch, as he who hath builded the house, hath more honor than the house." (Heb. 3. 3.) From this it is evident, that Christ is as much greater than Moses, as a human being is greater than a heap of inanimate matter. This certainly makes an infinite difference. Hence punishment for sins committed against Christ, must be as much severer than that inflicted for sins committed against Moses, as Christ is superior to Moses: and as there is an infinite difference between them, it follows that sins against Christ are infinite, and must necessarily deserve infinite punishment. The true ground upon this subject has been lost sight of by my opponent entirely. He supposes that sin must be measured by the dignity of the offender. But such is not the fact. The meanest slave, might murder the king upon his throne, as easily as the most dignified nobleman in the whole realm. Hence the heinousness, or enormity of sin, consists altogether in the dignity of the character insulted. "He that despised Moses's law," says Paul, "died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of *how much sorer punishment* suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God?" (Heb. 10. 28. 29.) I answer: just as much *sorer* than death without mercy, (which was the very utmost extent of finite punishment,) as the creator is superior to the thing created; or as a man is more dignified than a piece of wood! From this, and the foregoing arguments, it must be evident to this audience, as well as to my worthy opponent, that sins committed against God, and against Christ are infinite offenses, and, as such, must deserve infinite punishment. I have taken up all the points in my opponent's

last speech, that I now recollect, and will therefore give way and hear his defense.

ALPHA'S SIXTH SPEECH.

Gentlemen and ladies: I am still alive; notwithstanding my opponent manifests such uncommon anxiety that I should commit suicide. I presume he would be glad to get me out of the way; but I intend to live as long as I can see any one else living?

He informed us that he replied to all my arguments, or all he could recollect! He must have a wonderful treacherous memory, for the principal argument upon which I relied in my last speech, and which I introduced in the one preceding that, has been passed by with sheer neglect. Those points which he thought he could succeed in turning into ridicule, he has assailed, and he unquestionably deserves a pewter medal, for the extraordinary dexterity and adroitness with which he can build up cob-houses, simply for the fun of kicking them over! But the argument to which he has not replied, is based upon the true and scriptural design of punishment. I have quoted several texts of scripture to prove that punishment is always for the good of the offender, and that it has no other object in view, than his reformation. I shall not consume time to requote these texts, as I presume the audience recollects them, if my friend does not. I intend however to argue the point still farther.

As punishment is to be inflicted for the good of the offender, it will continue till he is reformed, and no longer. This is self evident. Whenever punishment goes beyond reformation, or ceases to be corrective, it is unjust and vindictive. But we are not to look upon God, as possessing such a character as this view of the subject holds forth: neither could we love him if we did. My opponent would make us believe, that the God of love, the Father of mercies, and the God of all consolation and comfort, was a being to be feared: but this shows the state of his own soul. His love is not yet perfect; for John says: "There is no fear in love, but perfect love

casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth, is not made perfect in love." (1 Jo. 4. 18.) I wish to make the people understand, that God is not the being he is represented to be: that although he will punish the wicked; yet he is not to be feared, since, like a a kind father, he chastises us for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness! God never holds out punishment as an end, but always as a means. Here is where my friend misunderstands the whole economy of salvation. He looks at punishment as an evil of a positive character: but if an evil at all, it is a necessary evil, as no man can be reformed without it. It is the true panacea by which the malady of sin is healed. This is the only reasonable view of this subject; and in no other way could God manifest the character of a father, than to punish us for our benefit. What father would see his child weltering in flames, and not take him out, when he could do it as well as not: even supposing the child had transgressed his commands? If the father should not make his son happy, and deliver him from his suffering condition, it would be either because he lacked ability or a disposition. And as God lacks neither ability nor disposition, he must therefore make all his creatures as happy as they can be. This being true: way goes the cruel dogma of endless torment.

But nature, as well as reason, is in favor of Universal salvation; and opposed to the doctrine of my opponent. In nature we can see the reason of things, and the adaptation of means to ends; but what is the use of a devil, and a future endless hell? No man can account for this! yet it is but one absurdity, out of a great multitude which no man could number, attending the system of orthodoxy! Look how God has garnished the earth and the heavens with riches and beauty? See how he pours down the refreshing showers of rain, and makes the earth to bring forth food to all alike. Here you see none of this partiality in the works of nature, which is continually preached up by our opponents, as the works and ways of God. Hence, I claim nature as a strong and *insurmountable* proof in favor of my position.

But so many facts, and so many different ideas have presented themselves to my mind, that I had like to have forgotten the main argument in this discussion, upon which I started out: that is, the *foreknowledge of God!* When the discussion commenced, I had intended to make this my strong ground; but I have been led into so many other matters, that it is almost too late, (as I have but one speech more,) to carry out the argument very extensively! But I shall endeavor to give the audience an idea of the bearing of this argument, upon the issue of this discussion.

I have taken the ground before; but I take it now especially, that foreknowledge does, and must imply foreordination; or that whenever God foreknew that a thing would take place, he that instant decreed it. My friend may bring up the idea, as one of his colleagues did in a recent discussion, that the astronomer may foreknow and foresee that an eclipse will darken the sun, at such an hour, and at such a minute: yet his foreknowing it, will not have the least tendency to bring about that event! I admit this to be correct: yet it is not a parallel case by any means. The astronomer had no hand in establishing the laws by which that eclipse was brought upon the sun at that time. But suppose the astronomer had created the sun and the moon, and knew at the same time he was making them, that this eclipse would occur at this precise time: and not only so, but even then he established the law which he knew would certainly result in that very manner: I ask, did he not design such an event to take place? You must, my fellow-citizens, admit he did. The man who makes a watch, knowing, when he is framing it, that it will run down in twelve hours after being wound up, designs it to run that long and no longer. This is a undeniable fact. Thus it was when God made man. He knew, when the idea of the creation of man was first conceived, all the various, and inconceivably complicated circumstances and vicissitudes through which he would pass, from his creation, to the most remote period of his

existence. When God said, "let us make man," he knew exactly his destiny, and he made him in such a way, and gave him such powers and propensities, as he knew would lead him into just such a course of conduct; and hence he must, knowing all these circumstances, have designed him to be just what he is, and just what he ever will be to all eternity. If any are the eternal loosers by their existence, God knew it before their creation, and I do contend, that if God created them with this certain knowledge before him, he must have designed them to be, whatever in the history of time and eternity he knew they would be. From this there is no way of escape. If any one can evade this conclusion, my opponent is undoubtedly the man; for he has twisted out of as many hard places since the commencement of this debate, I'll venture the assertion, as any other man ever did in so short a time. I have several other things to present, in connection with this last argument; but will reserve them for the next, which will be my closing speech. I now have the platform effectually laid, for turning topsyturvy the whole citadel of orthodoxy; and if that platform be not moved out of the way, his cause must come down. I hope the audience will bear in mind my position, that God acting, when he knows that what he is doing will result in a certain way, designs such to be the result.

OMEGA'S SIXTH REPLY.

Respected audience: I say with my opponent, that I hope you will bear in mind the argument last presented, until the close of my speech; when I shall take it into consideration. The whole argument on the design of punishment is now presented, and it is as well fortified as I ever heard it. I either lost my notes of that argument, or omitted taking any, and this is the reason why I did not take it up in my last rejoinder. I am now glad that such was the case, for not more than one half of the argument was then presented.

My friend has taken the broad ground that all pun-

ishment is disciplinary, and inflicted for the reformation of the offender. He quotes a text: "Thou shalt consider in thy heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee." This is true: When God administers chastisement, or disciplinary punishment, he does it upon the same principle, that a father would correct his son. But how is it, when God takes vengeance upon the wicked? Is this chastisement? By no means. The apostle Paul makes it obligatory upon the father to correct his son for his benefit: "For what son is he whom the father chasteneth not!" But he forbids man to take vengeance in any case whatever, assuring him that "Vengeance is mine, I will repay saith the Lord." This demonstrates that *vengeance* and *chastisement* are two things entirely different. If not, why enjoin one, and so pointedly forbid the other? From this it follows, (as chastisement is for the benefit of the punished, and vengeance is an entirely different thing,) that vengeance is not executed for the good of the offender; and as vengeance is punishment, it follows, beyond controversy, that my friend is wofully deceived, when he contends that all punishment is disciplinary. If vengeance be for the good of those upon whom it is inflicted, why did the apostle forbid men to inflict it? Did he forbid men to do good to their neighbors? No, for he commands us to "do good to all men," aud if vengeance be for the good of man, we have a right to inflict it.

My friend is altogether mistaken, when he supposes the reformation of the offender, the only design of punishment. Punishment may be inflicted for three other objects, under any well organized government, and these objects are necessary and essential to the existence of any government, in its relations to the governor and subjects. They are 1. To sustain the honor and dignity of the authority, by which the government is established and administered. 2. To guard the innocent from the danger to which they would be exposed, by letting the wicked go unpunished. 3. To be an example to those

who should afterwards live ungodly: and 4. The reformation of the offender. My opponent appears to be a man of one idea: hence he can see but one design in punishment when there are four! Whenever God punishes the wicked, for trampling under foot his authority, he does it for the purpose of sustaining his majesty and honor, and such punishment can be strictly termed vengeance. But if its object be simply to reform the offender, it is called chastisement, which is as far from the idea of vengeance, as day is from night. In not one instance where vengeance occurs in the bible was it for the good of the punished; neither is chastisement ever called vengeance: but its first and leading object, was to sustain the character and veracity of God, as a wise and just Lawgiver. Were the Sodomites punished for their reformation? Not exactly, neither was their punishment ever called chastisement. Jude says: they were "set forth for *an example*, suffering the *vengeance* of eternal fire." [Jude 7.] The wicked who fell in the wilderness, were not punished for their benefit, but to sustain the honor of God, and to be an example to others: "All these things happened unto them for *ensamples*, and they are written for our *admonition*." [1 Cor. 10. 11.] In each of these cases, the punishment was not only an example to others, but also for the purpose of delivering the godly out of temptation. If pouring down fire and brimstone upon the heads of men till they are burned up, be designed for their benefit, in order to reform them; it is certainly a reformation with a *vengeance*. But the final destruction of the wicked at the end of time, it may be said, can neither be an example to others who would afterwards live ungodly, nor add to the safety of the saints in heaven. But who knows but that myriads of those worlds, which are now swimming in the void immense, will exist ages after the dissolution of this earth, whose inhabitants will need something of this kind as a warning? And who knows, but that the final destruction of the wicked will serve to them, as the history of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the unalterable

destiny of fallen angels do to us? As regards the safety of the saints, I conclude, that if the wicked, who are so incorrigible here, as to confront the power and authority of God; and to endanger the peace and safety of the saints, should be involuntarily taken to heaven, the saints would be no safer there than here. But be this as it may, the veracity of God must be sustained; and he has threatened the wicked with an everlasting destruction from his presence, as an infinite motive, to deter from the commission of crime, and he is bound to inflict it, as it is impossible for him to lie.

But my opponent says, that whenever punishment ceases to be corrective, it is unjust and vindictive. He contends also, that God punishes the wicked every day, as long as they remain wicked. These two declarations prove positively, that God is cruel and unjust, if he punish the wicked at all; for the apostle says: "Evil men and seducers wax *worse* and *worse*, deceiving and being deceived." [2 Tim. 3. 13.] Hence God dare not inflict punishment upon such characters, upon the peril of his justice; for they would only grow *worse* and *worse* under it, and consequently it would not be corrective! Now let my friend avoid this difficulty if he can. God will not punish a man who will not be reformed by it; and such cases there are in almost innumerable instances!—All wicked men and seducers, because punishment in their case would not be corrective, must slip off to heaven without any punishment at all: for God would be unjust and vindictive in punishing them, when their punishment, so far from being corrective, would only make them worse, instead of better! Here then my friend's doctrine lets the profligate conscience-seared wretch run at large, free from all restraint, because God dare not punish him, if the punishment did not make him better! But he may say God designed the punishment to reform him, and hence it is not unjust. But stop: God designed it to reform him, and that design be frustrated? Why then may not the design of universal salvation be frustrated upon the same principle?

If all punishment be designed only as a mild chastisement, as my friend argues; it is singuiar that God should express himself as he does, when declaring his intention to punish the wicked. Suppose a father is about to correct his son for misconduct, and designs only administering a few disciplinary stripes for his benefit, in order to reform him, and makes use of the following language: Come up here sir: "Vengeance is mine, and I will repay it." "My fury is waxed hot, and my wrath is kindled against you," even "wrath without mixture." "Good were it for you had you never been born;" for "I will never forgive you, in this world, nor in that which is to come;" but will "punish you with an everlasting destruction in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched, and where you shall be tormented day and night forever and ever, with hypocrites and unbelievers; and where there shall be weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth." You "shall have no rest day nor night;" for you shall experience a far sorer punishment than dying without mercy, when "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" shall be poured upon you, and you shall hear me say: "Depart from me thou cursed boy, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels!!!"—One of three conclusions must the boy come to, when he hears his father make such horrible threats: either 1. That he has become perfectly insane: or 2. That he is jesting; or 3. That endless damnation is to be his inevitable doom, just as certain as his father has power sufficient to inflict it! No man, with a thimble full of mother-wit, would think, that by such terrible denunciations, he meant any thing more or less than eternal perdition. Yet my opponent would endeavor to make us think, that all such fearful threatenings, which is but a tithe of what the bible contains, only convey the idea of a mild disciplinary correction, designed solely for the benefit of the transgressor!!"

But if it be true, as my friend argues, that all punish*ment is* designed for the good of the offender, as a pana-

cea, to cure the disease of sin; then all the *curses* of the bible are immediately converted into *blessings*. Would my opponent, if he were very sick, consider that the physician was going to *curse* him, if he should come to administer a dose of medicine, in order to cure his disease? According to this doctrine, when God threatened men with punishment, it signifies in every case a *blessing*, as it is invariably designed for the benefit of the punished. Thus we read: "Depart from me ye *blessed*, into everlasting *medicine*, prepared for the devil and his angels." [Math. 25. 41.] "Who shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a *blessing*." [Mal. 4. 6.] Sodom and Gomorrah were "set forth for an example, *enjoying* the *blessing* of eternal *medicine*." [Jude 8.] "The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers and whoremongers, and sorcerers and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which *is blessed* with *medicine* and brimstone, which is the second *dose*." [Rev. 21. 8.] "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming *medicine*, pouring *mercy* on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be *blessed* with an everlasting *panacea* from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." [2 Th. 1. 7–9.] What a *blessed* figure Uiversalism cuts with the bible! But if all curses are blessings, why not make it a good rule, and let it work both ways? Thus: "Then shall the King say to them on his right hand: Come ye *cursed* of my father, inherit the kingdom, prepared for you from the foundation of the world." [Math. 25. 34.] "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be *cursed*." [Gen. 22. 18.] "*Cursed* are the dead that die in the Lord." [Rev. 14. 13.] "*Cursed* are the poor in spirit, for their's is the kingdom of heaven." "*Cursed* are they which mourn, for they shall be comforted." "*Cursed* are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." "*Cursed* are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." "*Cursed* are the merciful,

for they shall obtain mercy." "*Cursed* are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." "*Cursed* are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." [Math. 5. 3–9.] In the language of my opponent: How transcendantly sublime is the faith of Universalism?

But he tells us that punishment is the medicine for sin, and that no man can be reformed without it. Let us now look at a case: A man lives in sin all his life, grows *worse* and *worse*, the longer he lives, and is punished all the while: and finally, when he becomes the most depraved, and consequently the most deserving of punishment, he is struck instantly dead in the very act of committing murder; and thus goes into eternity unreformed. Now since no man can be reformed without punishment, it follows, incontrovertibly, that this man will remain unreformed to all eternity; for my friend has argued strongly, since the commencement of this discussion, that punishment will in no case extend into eternity! Hence, all those who die in their sins, or die unreformed, will remain sinners eternally: and as sin and misery are inseparably connected, as my friend contends, it proves endless misery to a demonstration! But should he back out of his old ground, and admit that punishment may extend into eternity, in order to reform those who go there unreformed, still it will not better the matter in the least; for, as we have a right to infer what will be from what has been, we can draw no other conclusion, than that they will continue to grow *worse* and *worse* in eternity, notwithstanding all their punishment, for such verily was the case with them here! Will he tell us, that surrounding circumstances will be more favorable in eternity, for their reformation, than they are here? Not so: for as one man goes into the future state unreformed, myriads of others will go in the same way, and be hail! fellows, well met! They can thus, instead of being weakened, assist and co-operate with each other, in carrying out their hellish schemes of wickedness, until they get as bad as the devil himself; who, methinks, would be a hard candidate to be worked over into a

christian, since he has been taking medicine for nearly six thousand years, and is not much better now, I reckon, than he was at first!!

But my opponent tells us, that punishment is always a *means*, and never an *end!* In this again he is mistaken. Paul says, concerning the wicked, who were past being reformed, either in time or eternity: "WHOSE END IS DESTRUCTION." [Phil. 3. 18.] Disciplinary punishment is always a means, I admit; but when punishment amounts to a destruction, it is no longer disciplinary, neither is it any longer a *means;* but is in reality the *end*, which the wicked bring upon themselves by their evil conduct. The chastisement spoken of in the 12th of Hebrews, which my friend quoted, was punishment, when it was used only as a means: for the apostle says, it is "for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness." But who will be partakers of his holiness, through this chastisement? My opponent did not quote the whole text, or it would need no remark. "Nevertheless, afterwards, it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness, *to them who are* EXERCISED *thereby.*" But how about those who will not be *exercised* by it? They will not be reformed by it, of course, and consequently it will not work in them the peaceable fruits of righteousness!

But the strongest reason of all, why punishment is not always for the good of the sinner, is because it is sometimes inflicted without *mercy!* If it were for his good, it would, as I have already shown, be a blessing, and would consequently be an exhibition of the purest mercy. Such is the case with all disciplinary punishment, or chastisement; it is administered in mercy: but when it amounts to vengeance, it is administered in *justice;* but *mercy* is utterly excluded: and hence it cannot be for the benefit of the transgressor. Am I sustained by the law and the testimony? "He that despised Moses's law, *died without mercy.*" [Heb. 10. 28.] Was this for his benefit. Again: "Therefore will I also deal in *fury*, [vengeance,] *mine eye shall not spare*, neither will I have pity." [Ezek.

8. 18] When God deals in *fury*, or exercises *vengeance*, it is not as a father chastises his son, for it is without *mercy*, and without *pity!* Is such punishment for the good of the punished?

But my friend asks: would a father see his son perishing in the flames, and not help him out, if he could? and has not our heavenly Father as much compassion as man? All I have to do, in answering that question, is, to get my friend to try the experiment. Let him get drunk, and fall into the fire, and see how long he would lay there, before the Almighty would pull him out! Or let him go out and crawl into the snow, and wait for God to help him out, and he will lay there till doom's day. His earthly father might take compassion on him, and help him; yet God does not, and will not do it.—Perhaps at this very instant, there is a ship in a storm, with five hundred passengers, all just about going to the bottom of the ocean. How easily could the Almighty say: "Peace, be still;" yet he does not, and they go down amid cries for mercy. Would not the President of the United States have stayed the wind, and calmed the tempestuous ocean, had he possessed power adequate to the task? He certainly would; yet the Almighty did not, although one word would have smoothed the bosom of the boisterous deep, as the polished surface of the granite marble.

My friend concludes, that if God does not make all men as happy as they can be, he lacks either ability or disposition. But God has just as much ability and disposition now, as he ever will have; and thus the conclusion is avoidable, that all men are just now as happy as they ever can be! Hence, my opponent is compelled to admit, that God cannot possibly make some men happier than to keep them in their sins forever!

But the feelings of an earthly father is no test of the feelings of God. It is the natural feeling, and inclination of the father to screen his son from the demands of justice, when he has been guilty of some capital offense. But who can impute such a disposition to Jehovah?—

He once passed a law against parents' screening their children from the demands of justice, which proves to a demonstration, that in cases of stubbornness and rebellion, justice demands more than *chastisement:* "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that when they have *chastened* him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of the city, and unto the gate of his place: and they shall say unto the elders of the city: this our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice, he is a glutton and he is a drunkard: and all the men of his city *shall stone him with stones that he die.*" [Deut. 21. 18–21.] Thus, after chastisement was resorted to, and it proved ineffectual, he must then die without mercy, or in other words, vengeance must be taken. My friend would hardly select such a father, to prove his doctrine by; yet it is precisely what God commanded! It is certainly an uphill business, and my opponent has found it so, to prove Universalism from our limited ideas of God. The Sodomites might have reasoned the eyes out of the angels, when they came to warn them of their destiny! Why, God is too good to destroy us. What! talk about a God of love,—the Father of our spirits, pouring down fire and brimstone upon the heads of his children! Not so: here we are,—we did not create ourselves, and God knew before he made us what would be our destiny, and had he seen that such was to be our end, he would most certainly have withheld our existence! More than this:—God does not punish, only for the good of the offender, in order to secure his reformation: and what good do you think it would do us to be roasted to death in fire and brimstone? How could such punishment produce reformation? What earthly father would be so cruel, as to pour fire and brimstone upon the heads of his offspring, and see them burn to death? How much less would God, who is infinitely better than any earthly parent can possibly be? Thus could the Sodomites have philoso-

phized, and logically inferred, that the angels were preaching a false doctrine, and that no such dreadful calamity should ever come upon them! But the fire and brimstone burnt up their philosophy, and left them naked and exposed to the ire of infinite wrath!

My friend comes to the conclusion, that God is not to be feared. This is perfectly compatible with his other views: for if God punishes men only for their good, where is there necessity or ground for fear? But here again, is my opponent in direct opposition to the whole tenor of revelation. "Work out your salvation with *fear* and *trembling*." [Phil. 2. 12.] "Let us therefore *fear*, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it." [Heb. 4. 1.]—"Knowing therefore the *terror* of the Lord, we persuade men." [2 Cor. 5. 11.] "Let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly *fear*; for our God is a *consuming fire*." [Heb. 12. 28, 29.] "It is a *fearful* thing to fall into the hands of the living God." [Ibid. 10. 31.] Such is a sample of the testimony in direct contradiction to my friend's theory: and can it be possible, that a doctrine so diametrically opposed to the bible, can be the truth? It some how finds advocates,—true or false!

But there is a text in John, which my friend thinks in favor of the position that God is not to be feared.—"There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment: he that feareth is not made perfect in love." [1 John 4. 18.] But suppose this does teach what he thinks it does; it would only be arraying the bible against itself. But the apostle, in the verse preceding this text, tells us what he is speaking of, and what it is that the christian does not fear. "Herein is our love made perfect that we may have boldness in *the day of judgment*." [Verse 17.] No man who loves the Lord, and obeys his commandments, will *fear* the day of *judgment*:—"There is no (*such*) fear in love: but perfect love casteth out (*all such*) fear: because (*such*) fear *hath torment*: he that feareth (the day of judgment,) is

not made perfect in love." My friend would do well to take into consideration, when he reads a text, what the writer has before him.

But nature, he thinks, is against me. God sends down the refreshing showers of rain, and makes the sun to shine on all alike. True: but what good will all this do us, if we do not improve it in cultivating the soil?—"The sluggard will not plow by reason of the cold; he shall therefore beg for bread in harvest and have nothing." Notwithstanding "God makes his sun to shine on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust," yet he will let a man starve to death, if he will not attend to the ordinances of nature, and receive the bounties of providence, in God's own appointed way! Just so, has God made provisions for the spiritual necessities of man, in the plan of salvation. The Son of Righteousness was given for us all, but the man who will not receive his benefits, by attending to the ordinances of religion, will be as certain of losing all interest in Christ, and consequently eternal felicity, as the man is certain of death, who will not comply with the demands, or ordinances of nature! Hence, nature is against Universalism; and as the God of nature is the God of the bible, my friend is compelled to give his doctrine up! All the blessings of providence are suspended upon *conditions*, although the blessings themselves are freely provided, and extended to all alike. How then can my opponent infer an unconditional heaven, from the system and operations of nature? I fear his purblind theology will lead him into difficulty, unless he come out like a man and give it up.

Every thing in nature goes to prove, first the preparation, and then the enjoyment of the blessing. Spring is the time to prepare for summer, summer for autumn, and autumn for winter. That which nature has allotted to spring, is not to be put off till summer; and the business of summer cannot be delayed till autumn; neither can the work assigned to autumn be postponed till winter. Thus every thing in nature sustains the doctrine

of probation. Suppose my friend should act consistently, and preach the same doctrine concerning nature, that he does with reference to the bible. He convenes a congregation of farmers together, and commences: "God is infinite in wisdom, power, and goodness;—he is good to all, and his tender mercy is over all his works. God is love, and loves all men alike, and will be infinitely better to all mankind, than an earthly father can be to his own dear offspring; and hence you will all be certain of an abundant harvest next fall, whether you plow, sow your grain, or make any preparations for it, or not. You remember the covenant with Noah: that 'summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, should continue,' and will God be guilty of breaking his own covenant? By no means: harvest must then certainly continue! It cannot be otherwise: for how can God be good to all, if he should give them nothing to eat, and thus let them starve to death? It is true, it is right, and best for you to work, and cultivate the soil, for God has commanded it, and it is necessary in order to your enjoyment before harvest. You will feel better to exercise yourselves, and you will have a clear conscience, and enjoy better health than if you should be idle. But still an abundant harvest is just as certain if you do not work, as though you do." No doubt the farmers would at once be taken with the idea of getting such a cheap harvest: and although they might all be willing to admit, that men would feel better to work than to be idle, yet they would play, notwithsanding; for who would have so little sense as to plow and sow, when he was just as certain of a crop without it? It is true, they might occasionally feel hungry before harvest, if they did not work; but still, the absolute certainty of plenty, would make their hunger easy to be borne; and knowing that God was so good, that he would not let them die, they would play any how, and contend that if they should be hungry, it would only give them a better appetite for the coming feast! And they would even laugh at the poor deluded farmer, who had so little brains, as to think he must get his bread

by the sweat of his face! But when harvest comes, my opponent's converts go out to their fields, expecting to find them lined with the rich products of nature: but, to the utter destruction of their hopes, they see nothing but a barren waste: whilst their orthodox neighbors are thrusting in their sickles, and gathering richly the golden sheaves! But these Universalian farmers, poor fellows, must starve to death, notwithstanding God is *love*, and notwithstanding his infinity of *wisdom*, *power*, and *goodness!*

But still farther. Every thing in nature, is under the influence of two equal powers. The earth, in its revolution round the sun, is equally governed by two forces acting in unison upon it. The centripetal force attracting it to the sun; and the centrifugal, propelling it the contrary direction. Should the centripetal overpower the centrifugal, the earth would be whirled to the great center, and confusion and chaos would be the inevitable result. But should the centrifugal overcome the centripetal, the contrary effect must ensue;—the earth would leave her orbit, and fly uncontrolled through regions of unlimited space. But both these forces operating equally upon the earth, cause it to keep its proper orbit, and to perform its revolutions in the most perfect order and harmony! The vegetable creation is equally under the control of two influences—the root in the ground, and the top in the air. Take it up, and leave it wholly in the air, and it will die. Cover it entirely under ground, and it cannot live. So is man, as a moral being, under the influence of two equal and antipodal powers, namely: *hope* and *fear*. Let him hope for that, which he fears he will loose, and if any exertion can be made on his part, adequate to securing the desired object, that exertion will be made! But let him hope for a thing, and desire it ever so much; yet if he has no fear of losing the desired object, will such a hope cause him to act? Nay verily! But let that hope be balanced by fear, and it will produce exertion. Hope is a powerful incentive to action, when properly balanced; but will produce no effect by itself. Induce a man to hope for an abundant

harvest, which will be certain, whether he cultivates the soil or not, and such hope will never produce action. But make him hope to get a crop, if he till the ground; and if he will not, make him fear he will starve to death, and if any thing can be done on his part, that will secure the object desired, he will most unquestionably do it.—Hence the necessity of having the hope of immortality balanced by *fear*, which is equal to it. But Universalists have it all *hope* and no *fear*, except the fear of a little remorse of conscience, which will be about the same, when compared with the hope of endless felicity, and the man possessing it, will be about in the same condition, as the earth, if deprived of nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of her centripetal force! The audience can guess the result. But let a man be equally balanced by the centripetal and centrifugal forces of the hope of eternal beatitude, and the fear of endless destruction; and let them both operate in unison upon him, and they will keep him in his proper orbit of moral rectitude, and cause him to sustain his proper relation to the Son of Righteousness, the great center of the moral heavens?

But my opponent thinks all things in nature very easily accounted for; but he can't see the use of a future hell! But suppose I could not account for a future hell, that is no sign that God could not. The man who looks upon a steamboat could not, perhaps, see the use nor propriety of all the wheels, balls, pivots, screws, rods, &c., whilst the engineer, at a single glance, could underderstand the use and adaptation of every part. The only idea I have of a future hell is, that it was "prepared for the devil and his angels." Ah, say you, that's it: not for *men!* True enough, it was not prepared for men, but a great number of men, I fear, have prepared themselves for it: and many, who, like my opponent, are very curious to find out the use of a future hell, may find out soon enough. But the idea of a future hell is an absurdity of the first magnitude, in the estimation of my friend. But where was the propriety, permit me to ask, of God creating so many mountains, which are of no benefit, but are

frequently a great curse, and many times cast forth rivers of melted lava, upon thousands of innocent inhabitants, who perish amidst the common devastation?—Where was the necessity of making such trackless wastes of waters, and so many unexplored deserts, where nothing is to be seen but perpetual sands: and nothing felt, but the scorching rays of an angry and indignant sun? Can my friend account for this? He cannot. And no doubt, had he been the Lord's counsellor, such unnecessary and troublesome things would never have had an existence! Had the affairs of the universe been entrusted to the astonishing wisdom of some penetrating Universalist, we would now have no snakes to bite us, or earthquakes and pestilence to make us afraid! No tornados would ever have come near our peaceful dwellings; whilst the unreasonable extremes of summer's heat, and winter's cold, would have been entire strangers to our terrestrial paradise! Delightful, beautified, and variegated would have been the scenery spread out continually before us, to enrapture our vision; whilst odoriferous fragrance, floating on the aromatic gales, would have charmed away all sorrow from our Eden of love!

But finally, he has gone back to the old starting place, and brought up a reinforcement on the foreknowledge of God. This appears to be his last resort. Hence, if this gives way, his cause must come down! He lays down the position, that God, foreknowing that man would sin, and then creating him, with this certain foreknowledge before him, was designing him to sin! I have thought of this difficulty before, and I freely confess, that I have never been able fully to dispose of it; neither did I ever find a man that could. But we have examined the doctrine of God decreeing sin, and then punishing man for doing what he could not help; and we have found that it leads to innumerable absurdities and contradictions, which neither I nor my opponent can reconcile. This he has acknowledged since the commencement of this debate. Hence, that cannot be the true ground; and as I cannot dispose of my opponent's con-

clusions, there is no other way possible, for both of us, to avoid difficulties and absurdities, except to deny his premises, and take the ground, that God did not, neither was it necessary for him to foreknow that man would sin, when he created him! This may be a *brand new* position to my opponent, as well as to many in this audience; but lay aside your prejudices, all of you, until the point is fairly argued, and then decide! Now do not understand me to say, that God could not have known that man would sin, had he been disposed to know it; this is not my ground: but my position is, that it was not necessary for him to know it, and that he had power enough to keep from it! My opponent may accuse me of limiting the knowledge of God. But I do not; yet I do contend, that God had power sufficient to limit his own knowledge; and that he has exercised that power in certain cases. But I shall not anticipate my opponent's objections. He shall have the privilege of doing his very best, in his closing speech. I wish it to be remembered, however, that my opponent boasted, at the commencement of this discussion, that he was no *limitarian!* No, no, not he; yet he is the very man who *limits* the power of God to such an extent, that he CANNOT *possibly* keep from foreknowing every event that takes place! Yes: he is no *limitarian*, yet God MUST know, from all eternity, every thing that comes to pass; and he had not power sufficient to keep a single thing out of his mind, had he wished to ever so much! Yes, my friend is no *limitarian;* yet he teaches, that by some irresistible necessity, over which God has not, and *cannot* exercise the least control, he is *compelled* to foreknow every conceivable circumstance, that would ever occur, even if the destiny of his Almighty throne should be at stake! Now let my ground be fairly understood,—that God has power to foreknow an event, or he has power to keep it out of his mind, whichever he prefers; and if my opponent deny him this power, then he is the *limitarian*, and not I! Neither do I take the position, that the attribute of knowledge is not *infinite*. It would be an

absurdity to suppose, that a finite attribute could belong to the *infinite* God! But the attribute of power is just as infinite as that of knowledge; yet it does not necessarily follow, because God's power is infinite, that he must therefore do every thing that is, or has been done: for man has done many things that God did not do, nor never will do, to all eternity. By infinite power, we understand, not that God must necessarily do every thing, but simply the infinite ability to do any thing he pleases, or any thing that will be compatible with his other attributes! Thus we understand the infinite attribute of knowledge, not the knowing of every thing, but simply the infinite ability to know any thing, and every thing that will harmonize with his other attributes, and the nature of his moral government! Or, in other words, my position is, that God can *do* what he pleases, and *know* what he pleases, and that no man can "find out the Almighty unto *perfection*." This view of the subject will, if sustained, not only effectually kill Universalism, and pluck it up by the roots; but it will exonerate the character of God from the foul aspersions my opponent's doctrine is calculated to throw upon it, by making him out the arbitrary author of sin and all our woes!

But, before taking my seat, I wish to present some four or five scripture testimonies, in favor of my position, that certain things have occurred that God did not foreknow; and then hear my friend dispose of them if he can.—"And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not, *neither came it into my heart*." [Jer. 7. 31.] This testimony is pointed and emphatic, and those abominations, which the Jews practiced, never entered into God's heart! This is most unaccountably strange, when he had decreed them from all eternity! "And the Lord said, because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous: I will go down now, *and see* whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me, *and if not I will know!!*"

[Gen. 18. 20.] Thus, according to this testimony, the Almighty did not know how bad the Sodomites had acted, until he went down to see! This, to the mind of some, might convey rather a diminutive idea of God; but it is not to be supposed, that he could not have known without going down to see; and hence, it gives me a far more exalted idea of the perfections of Jehovah, to suppose him a being, capable of *doing* and *knowing* what he pleases,—making use of means, or working without them, just as he sees cause—than the theory which chains down the Almighty with the fetters of fatality, to the stake of the absolute necessity of foreknowing every event; whilst over the attribute of knowledge he cannot exercise the least control! But we have another evidence, which is even more pointed than the one just referred to. "*And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth*, and it *grieved* him at his heart: and the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created, from the face of the earth. [Gen. 6. 6, 7.] Now if God foreknew from all eternity, that men would practice wickedness; and if this knowledge was always alike perfect and present before his mind; why did he not repent, and why was he not grieved from all eternity, as well as when he saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth? If knowing that men *had* sinned, would cause the Almighty to be so grieved as to destroy them; why did the knowledge that they *would* sin, (if he possessed it,) cause him to be so grieved as never to create them? Could God consistently seek to grieve himself? If not, why did he make man, knowing, to an absolute certainty, that he would practice iniquity, until he would have to repent, and be grieved at the heart, and finally be compelled to destroy man whom he had created, from the face of the earth? The only refuge is, upon the position, that God did not know, before he created man, that he would sin; for the reason that he did not see cause to know it, and he had power sufficient to keep from it! Once more: "And the Lord repented of the evil, that he *thought* to do unto his people." [Ex. 32.

14.] Query: Did God *think* he would do that evil unto his people? Yes; for the bible says so. Did he *know*, at the same time, that he would repent of it, and not do it? If so, then his thoughts contradict his knowledge; which is the same thing, as for the Almighty to *think* that a thing would be one way, and *know*, at the same time, that it would be exactly the reverse! But such an absurdity could not exist: hence it follows, that just as certain as God *thought* to bring an evil upon his people, which the bible positively affirms, just so certain he did not *foreknow* that he would repent of that evil; and not do it! This is an unavoidable conclusion, and my opponent may dispose of it the best way he can.

ALPHA'S CLOSING SPEECH.

Gentlemen moderators and fellow citizens: You have, no doubt, become wearied somewhat, in listening so attentively to this discussion, for so long a time without an intermission. But we shall soon, now, come to a close, as this is my concluding address. I have endeavored, since the commencement of the debate, to make short speeches, and I supposed my opponent would do the same: yet his speeches, upon an average, have occupied nearly double the time mine has: but as there was nothing said in the preliminaries, with reference to the length of the speeches, he had a right, of course, to do as he pleased, and so had I.

My opponent is the greatest quibbler (not to use an approbious epithet) with whom I ever held a discussion. He puts me in mind of a wheel-wright in London, who put over the door of his shop: "All sorts of *twisting* and *turning* done here." I thought, when the argument on the design of punishment was presented, there was no way of evading it: but like the philosopher's stone, which turns every thing it touches into gold, so he can turn every thing he gets hold of into sophistry! When my last argument, on the foreknowledge of God, was presented, I was in anxious suspense to know in what way he would attempt to meet it: and lo! and behold, a new

thing under the sun made its appearance! God did not know before he made man that he would sin! Well, this is certainly a new doctrine, and it looks as unreasonable to me, as it is new. For the sake of brevity, I will leave the other points which have occupied the attention of the audience, in the former part of this discussion, and let them go for what they are worth; (although I had intended a brief recapitulation,) and will enter into an examination of this new theory of foreknowledge, during the short time I have to occupy in this speech.

I object to the doctrine of my opponent, for several considerations: 1. It would make out that the Almighty, at one time, was nearly a fool: and knew scarcely nothing at all? This is most preposterous and ridiculous: and the doctrine holding forth such a sentiment, cannot be regarded otherwise than false. This objection, unless moved out of the way, must sink the doctrine into oblivion.

2. My second objection is, that the Almighty would find out some things he did not know before, and consequently would be *disappointed!* This, of itself, would be all sufficient to make me disbelieve the doctrine; for what better would God be than man, if he could experience the chagrin of disappointment?

3. I object also to the doctrine, from the fact that it is a contradiction in terms, to say that God could keep from knowing a thing, before he knew it, that he might keep from it. As a matter of course, he must first know it before he could make up his mind not to know it! Here, then, is another absurdity, and one which condemns the dogma of my opponent!

4. I object to the assumption of God having power to curtail the attribute of knowledge, from the fact, that it necessarily leads to Atheism. If God can destroy one attribute, he can, on the same principle, destroy another, and in fact destroy all his attributes, and finally destroy *himself*, and cease to exist!

5. Another objection is, that God is ALLWISE,

whilst my opponent's theory makes him out only *part wise!* If he be *all wise*, then he must havefore known from all eternity every event that could possibly have occurred! Can my friend dispose of this? Not exactly!

6. I object, in the sixth place, to the theory of my opponent, from the consideration, that the scriptures most pointedly teach, that "God foreknew from all eternity whatsoever cometh to pass." The Lord declares by the mouth of the prophet: "I am God and there is none like me, declaring *the end from the beginning*, and from ancient times, the things that are not yet done." [Is. 46. 10.] James the apostle also testifies: "Known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world." [Acts 15. 18.] The apostle Paul affirms: "*All things* are naked and opened unto the eyes of him, with whom we have to do." [Heb. 4. 13.] This testimony, with many other texts as directly to the point, goes to show, beyond controversy, that God always foreknew every possible event that could ever occur in the history of all time, and all eternity!

7. I object to his doctrine, (that God did not know before he made man, that he would sin,) for this reason: The apostle testifies concerning Christ as a Saviour, that he "verily was *foreordained* before the *foundation of the world*." [1 Pet. 1. 20.] Now if God, before the foundation of the world, ordained Jesus Christ to be a Saviour, as the apostle here declares; then it follows, that God must have known, before the foundation of the world, that man would need a Saviour, and this could not possibly have been, had he not have known that man would commit sin in order to have something to be saved from! This argument, when fairly presented, speaks for itself, and needs no ingenuity to make it more forcible? The fact that God ordained Christ to be a Saviour before he had created man, proves to a demonstration that he knew that man would need a Saviour, and have something to be saved from. Let it not be *contended, to escape* this difficulty, that the "foundation

of the *world*," has reference to the commencement of the *age;* for this will not work. The original text strictly forbids such an exposition. The word is *cosmos*, (not *aion*,) which never signifies an *age* or *dispensation*, but in every case refers to this literal mundane sphere!

8. I object, in the eighth place, to my opponent's theory, because he had to pervert the text in Jeremiah, to sustain it. "Which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart:" that is, neither came it into my heart to *command it!* The idea is, not that it never entered into his heart that they would do such things; but it never entered into his heart to command them! Let this be borne in mind.

9. I object, in the ninth and last place, to the conclusions of my opponent; from the consideration that *repentance* and *grief*, when spoken of with respect to God, have not at all the same signification, as when applied to man; and we cannot tell to a certainty, or draw any definite conclusion from such premises, unless we are to understand *repenting* and *grieving*, when applied to God, the same as when applied to man! The above position my friend has assumed, without the least particle of evidence; whilst there is every probability, as well as plain matters of fact, in direct opposition to the assumption!

He should have known e'er this, that language, when applied to God, is used in an accommodated sense. But he appears to be ignorant of this fact, and has based his whole theory upon an assumption, which every student of the bible knows to be fallacious.

Having now presented my objections to his theory, it appears to me impossible, that any one in this audience can believe such a contradictory assumption. It must be evident, methinks, if we pay any respect to the bible or consistency, that God must have foreknown before he made man, that he would sin; and also that he made *him* so, that he must be whatever he foresaw that he would be, as his foreknowledge could not be disappointed. Hence I contend that endless punishment is out of the question. For if such a thing there be, it is ur-cond

ing to God's good pleasure, or it would not be, as God knew from eternity whether such a thing would be needed or not. And if he had foreknown that such a wretched disaster would have occurred, his infinite goodness would have withheld existence from those, whom he foresaw to be candidates for this interminable misery!

My opponent says but little in favor of this cruel and vindictive theory of ceaseless torture! And well he may; for what heart would not bleed, and what soul, that has ever been touched with the finger of God's love, would not revolt and shudder at the direful and horrible thought of endless wo! How dreadful the thought! And how little do the advocates of orthodoxy comprehend the idea conveyed by that word *endless!*—e-n-d-l-e-s-s t-o-r-m-e-n-t!!! Think, O think my audience, before you subscribe to such a soul-benumbing, heart-withering, and God-dishonoring sentiment. Fancy ten thousand times ten thousand of the longest conceivable ages in futurity, and then multiply them into themselves ten thousand times, and has endless suffering come to an end? Nay verily, it has only just commenced! Then extend your imaginations on a million times farther, if possible, into boundless futurity; and then subtract all these innumerable ages from the misery of the damned, and they have just as long to writhe in ceaseless torture, as when those ages of suffering first commenced!

"When these are gone, as many add to these,
As leaves, and buds, and blossoms crown the trees!
When these are gone, as many millions more,
As grains of sand upon the ocean's shore!
When these are gone, as many more shall pass,
As in the verdant fields are blades of grass!
When these are gone, as many more shall rise,
As stars and gems, that decorate the skies!
As many millions more their rounds shall run,
As rays of light, which burst from yonder sun!
When these are gone, as many more shall glide,
As drops of water in the swelling tide!

When these are gone, as many millions more,
As moments in the millions gone before!
As many more, this mighty sum shall swell,
But still the sinner groans in endless hell!!"

Great God! is such an exhibition of thy long-suffering? Are such the displays of the unbounded benevolence of our compassionate Saviour?!

I have never heard any man attempt to justify endless sufferings, or reconcile such a sentiment with any thing less than inexorable cruelty! And I expect nothing better of my opponent, than those who have preceded him!

But I am now, fellow-citizens, through with my arguments, and if my friend can dispose of the foregoing objections and difficulties, I am no longer an Universalist!

I close my part of this discussion, with perfectly good feelings towards my opponent; and as this debate is to be published, and committed to the rising generation, I sincerely desire that nothing of an unkind or unchristian spirit may be discovered in the speeches of your humble servant. I am glad that this large and respectable audience have waited and listened so patiently to the variety of facts and arguments presented to their consideration this day; and may they ponder them impartially, and make up their minds and act accordingly.

I must not forget to return my warmest respects and gratitude to the gentlemen who have presided so wisely and respectfully over our investigations. May you, with all who are now present, be guided in the ways of wisdom, and be preserved blameless unto the appearing of Jesus Christ.

OMEGA'S CONCLUDING REPLY.

Respected auditors: I shall promise to detain you but for a short time. My opponent seems willing to narrow the whole subject down, and suspend the issues of the present question upon the nine objections, which

you have heard presented. I will therefore, like him, leave all previous matters, to be read, and decided by the public, whilst the present speech shall be particularly devoted to the consideration of the foregoing objections. 1. His first objection was, that my doctrine makes out that the Almighty at one time was nearly a fool! Strange indeed! Suppose the Lord at one time knew nothing at all about this earth, or its inhabitants: the man who would suppose him nearly a fool on that account, must have the most insignificant conception of Jehovah imaginable. To suppose the Almighty a being, with no other dominions, and having nothing else to think about except this pitiful earth, (which, if struck out of existence, would leave no more of a blank, to an eye that could encompass creation, than would a single drop of water taken from the mighty Pacific!) is a far lower conception of his greatness and majesty, than I had ever yet formed an idea!

But I will now prove, according to my friend's doctrine, that the Almighty, at one time, was not only "*nearly*" but altogether a *fool*, to use the modest language of my opponent! He contends, that whenever a thing is foreknown, it is foreordained; or, in other words, that *foreknowledge* and *foreordination* imply the same thing. We admit this, for the sake of argument, and it follows, that there was a time when God foreknew nothing, as there must have been a time, when nothing was ordained. This I can demonstrate. If a thing be *ordained*, there is a *time when* it is done; and if a time when it is done, there must have been a time before it was done; and if a time before it was done, then it was not done from all eternity, unless eternity had a beginning. And as there was a time, according to this argument, when nothing was *ordained* or *decreed*, then it follows unquestionably, that there was a time when nothing was *foreknown;* for, let it be borne in mind, my opponent has repeatedly affirmed, since the commencement of this discussion, that the foreknowing and foreordaining of all events are simultaneous; *or, the* instant a thing is foreknown, it is

decreed! Here, then, is my opponent caught in the meshes of his own net, and his favorite hobby *reductio ad absurdum!* He is compelled, inevitably, to adopt one of two positions, either that God could have foreknown that man would sin, without having decreed it; or else, that he did not foreknow from all eternity that man would sin, neither did he foreknow any thing else! Either ground kills Universalism, and of course his doctrine is dead, let him go which way he will!

2. His next objection is, that if God should find out something he did not know before, he would be disappointed! But here again he limits the Almighty. How does he know that God would be disappointed, even if he should find out something new? How does he know but that God has power enough to keep from being disappointed, even if five hundred events should occur which he did not know before? And suppose he should be disappointed, how does my friend know that he would feel as we do when we are disappointed? And suppose he should; has he not power to feel thus? "He that formed the eye, can he not see? and he that formed the ear, can he not hear?" And I might ask, on the same principle, he who gave man the susceptibility of feeling disappointed, could he not feel so too? You recollect how my opponent charged us with *limitarianism* at the commencement of this debate! "They who live in glass houses, should not throw stones at their neighbors," is a maxim containing an excellent moral.

3. The third objection my friend endeavors to urge against my position is; that it is a contradiction in terms. How, he asks, can God keep from knowing a thing, before he knows it, that he may keep from it? I unequivocally answer, I cannot tell! But must I disbelieve all things, connected with the incomprehensible God, because I cannot understand them? My opponent appears to think so! But let me ask him a question which will offset this. How can God foreknow that any event will take place one thousand years previous to its accomplishment? If he will answer this query, I pledge

my word, to solve the hardest puzzle upon this subject, he can conjure up. Is it unreasonable to suppose, that the inconceivable power, which so far transcends all human thought, and which enables the Almighty to look through the dark vista of untold myriads of ages:—is it unreasonable, I ask, to suppose, that by such incomprehensible power, the Almighty could keep from knowing an event, even before that event ever came into his mind? One is no more unreasonable to me than the other!—Eternity, or duration, may be to God, what distance or space is to us. Suppose an avenue ten miles in length, hung with curtains, at the distance of one hundred yards from each other, which hide from view every thing beyond them. Then suppose you stand at one end of this avenue, where are suspended a number of chords attached to each of these supposed curtains, which you have the privilege of raising at will. Now you have it in your power to know what is beyond the first curtain, the second, the third, or any, or all of them; or you have it in your power not to know, whichever you prefer. If you raise the curtain, you will know,—if you choose to leave it down, you will not know! Thus you would have power to keep from knowing a thing, even before you knew it, that you might keep from it! Might not the Almighty Jehovah, on the same principle, have resolved not to lift the curtain of futurity, until he had accomplished the work of creation, and pronounced all things *good*? when, if any evil should occur, the Almighty would be clear, as he had made all in such a manner, as that there was no necessity for the existence of evil in any sense; and consequently the blame would fall justly upon the head of man. But when he saw, that man had abused the privileges and abilities which he had so bountifully conferred upon him for another purpose; he then lifts the vail of futurity, and devises the best plan of saving as many as he possibly could! Hence, according to this view of the subject, God could keep from knowing that man would sin, and my opponent's objection is therefore weighed in the balance and found wanting!!

4. His next objection to my theory of foreknowledge is, that it leads to Atheism. He concludes, that if God could destroy one of his attributes, he could destroy all, and finally destroy himself, and cease to exist! But why does my friend combat positions that are not in my premises? Who ever heard me take the ground, that God could destroy one of his attributes? None of you! But I do say, that God has power to limit the exercise of his attributes; if not, then the whole bible is a perfect enigma! Cannot God limit the exercise of his power? If not, then he must do every thing that ever has been, is, or ever will be done to all eternity. He must, on this principle, be guilty of all the abominations he has condemned in his word. My friend backed out of these absurdities, at the commencement of this debate, and confessed that he had seen them years ago; yet he seems still anxious to get back into the very same old absurd dogma, of God being the author of sin! But suppose God cannot limit the exercise of any of his attributes; then it follows, that he must *love* sin, the devil, and every thing that is mean and hateful! Now since God can limit the exercise of some of his attributes, as must be admitted, he can, on the same principle, limit the exercise of any of them, or else some of the attributes of an infinite God are inferior to others. As this will not be contended, my position is therefore fairly made out, that God could consistently limit the exercise of his knowledge. This is sufficient for that objection.

Now since our view of the subject does not lead to Atheism, permit me to ask, what is the result of my opponent's doctrine? If it do not lead to Atheism, it leads to fatality, and that too, of the very worst kind. It makes God himself a creature of fate, which is no better than to deny his existence. It not only binds man to an unalterable destiny, irrevocably marked out, millions of ages before Adam was created, by the immutable foreknowledge of God, which knows no disappointment: but it also chains down the Almighty Jehovah with the unyielding fetters of the absolute necessity of

foreknowing every event, and thus giving him a certain amount of knowledge, which he can neither add to, nor diminish from: in fact, it binds all his other attributes to the same point of unchangeable necessity; and thus we have the Father of spirits deprived of the principle of volition, and every thing like freedom of thought and action, and hand-cuffed perfectly, by this overruling system of super-Almighty fatalism!

5. Another objection, which my friend urges against my position, is, that God is *Allwise*, and must necessarily foreknow from all eternity, every thing that cometh to pass. But this does not follow, any more, than because God is *Almighty*, he must therefore *do* every thing that ever is done, which we have shown to be preposterous. The idea of God being *Almighty*, is, that he can do what he pleases; and, on the same principle, the fact of his being *Allwise*, is, that he can *know* what he pleases. This makes his attributes equal, the way every consistent person is compelled to view the subject.

6. In the sixth place, my friend objects to the view I have taken of the foreknowledge of God, from the fact, that the scriptures teach that "God from all eternity foreknew whatsoever cometh to pass." But I would inform my friend, and all concerned, that there is no such text in the bible, never was, nor never will be; although I have heard it quoted, perhaps a thousand times. There are texts, however, which speak of a very extensive foreknowledge, I admit, but not one which covers the whole ground taken by my opponent. For example: "I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the *end* from the *beginning*." If this signifies foreknowledge, then let me ask: did he know the *end* of sin, before it had a "*beginning?*" If not, then he did not know it from all eternity! If it was from "*ancient times*," as the text declares, then it was not from all eternity, for my friend would not, I think, argue that there were "*times*" in eternity before ever *time* had a beginning! Again: "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Why say, "from the *beginning* of the *world*," if it was

from all eternity? The word *world* here, is not *cosmos* in the Greek, but *aionos*, signifying an age, or dispensation. Neither does the text, "All things are naked and opened to the eyes of him with whom he have to do," help the objection of my opponent. Look at the language: "All things ARE naked and opened," in the present tense, not *were* naked and opened from all eternity! Mark this. There is no other text more to the point, than those my friend brought up; yet they come not within a thousand miles of disposing of my argument.

7. His next objection is, that God must have foreknown before he made man, that he would sin, from the fact that he ordained Christ to be a Saviour, "before the *foundation of the world*." I admit the word, in this case, to be *cosmos*, referring to the literal earth which we now inhabit. But I cannot believe that God would ordain Christ to save man from sin, before he was created; for upon this principle, as my friend has already urged, he must have decreed that man should commit sin, in order that Christ might perform the work, for which God had ordained him. I had always thought that a Saviour was prepared for sin; but according to this view of the subject, the Saviour was first prepared, and then sin was prepared for the Saviour, so that he should have something to do in his office.

God must have foreordained that mankind should sin,
That Christ might perform what was ordained for him;
As Christ *was* ordained, and his work he *must* do:
Then mankind *must* sin for to carry it through!

This is the puzzling point. If God foreordained that Christ should save man from sin, and then went to work and made him, with the certainty that he must sin, (as the decree concerning Christ could not be broken,) it follows inevitably, that God designed, in the creation of man, that he should sin, just as much as he designed that Christ should save him from it! This conclusion cannot be avoided, upon the ground of my opponent; and for this reason I do not at all believe, that God ordained

Christ to be a Saviour before he created man! But here the question comes up: how will you dispose of the testimony of Peter, that Christ was ordained before the foundation of the world, since you admit the word *world* to signify the literal earth? We shall let Peter settle the question: but in the first place we ask: Was there not a literal earth existing, before the one which we now inhabit? Peter answers. "For this they are willingly ignorant of, that by the word of God, the heavens were of old, and the *earth* standing out of the water and in the water, whereby the *world* (*cosmos*) that *then* was being overflowed with water *perished;* but the heavens and the *earth* which *are now*, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and the perdition of ungodly men." [2 Pet. 3. 5, 6.] This testimony is clear and pointed, that the *world*, or *cosmos*, which existed before the flood, being overflowed with water *perished*, or was *destroyed;* and that since then, there has existed another earth. Hence you discover, that the apostle keeps up the contrast between the *cosmos* or *earth* that *then was*, and the *earth* which *is now*, proving conclusively, that the earth which *is now*, is not the earth which existed before the flood! I know it is objected, that the earth was not destroyed,—that it was only the people. But I object to this objection for two reasons: 1. If the earth was not destroyed in the flood, then there is no sense nor propriety in the contrast kept up by the apostle, between the *earth* that *then was*, and the *earth* that *is now*, one being literally deluged in water, and the other destined to be as literally deluged in fire: and 2. My bible teaches positively that the earth was destroyed. "And behold," saith God, "I will *destroy* them with the *earth*." [Gen. 6. 13.] "And I will establish my covenant with you, neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood, neither shall there be any more a flood *to destroy the earth*." [Gen. 9. 11.] What this destruction of the earth was, is not for me to say; neither do I take the ground that the materials of which the earth was composed, were destroyed; yet the

earth itself was destroyed, for so the bible repeatedly affirms. Suffice it to say, that some transformation, or disorganization of the earth took place in the flood, which justified the inspired writers to designate by the term *destruction!* Having thus premised, we draw the following irresistable conclusion, that Christ being "foreordained, before the foundation of the world," was sometime before the flood, in the antediluvian age, after sin was introduced! This is my sincere conviction upon this subject, neither do I believe it can be refuted. I do not see how men can believe with my opponent, and keep out of fatality. If they can, they possess powers of intellect, to which I am, and always expect to be a stranger!

8. Again: he objects to my application of the text from Jeremiah: "Which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart," that is, according to my opponent's objection, neither came it into my heart to command it! But this will never do. The grammatical construction of the language strictly forbids it. Now mark the phraseology: "*Which* I commanded them not." What? Ans: the burning of their sons and daughters in the fire. "Neither came *it*," i. e. the very thing which I commanded them not, namely, the burning of their sons and daughters in the fire; "neither came IT into my heart." The relative *which* refers to the *act* of burning their sons and daughters in the fire; and the pronoun *it*, personates the same thing precisely. The Lord says in another place: "They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, *which* I commanded them not, nor spake *it*, neither came *it* into my mind." [Jer. 19. 5.] "*Which* I commanded them not," namely, the *act* of burning their sons in the fire: "Nor spake *it*,"—the thing, of course, *which* I commanded them not: "Neither came *it*,"—the same *it*, and the same thing *which* I commanded them not:—"nor spake IT, neither came IT into my mind;" that is, it never came into my mind, that they would be guilty of such wicked conduct, as burning their sons in the fire for

burnt offerings unto Baal! This is most unquestionably the true and obvious idea of the text, as every grammarian must see.

9. We come, now, to the examination of his last objection, which is, that *grieving*, and *repenting*, and all such phrases, when applied to God, do not have the same meaning, nor convey the same idea, as when applied to men; that they are used in an accommodated sense!—This appears to be his last struggle. Well, we shall see. An accommodated sense! Who does it accommodate? Not God, certainly, for he needs no accommodation; and more than this, the revelation was not made to him, but to us. Hence the language must be accommodated to us, if accommodated at all. Now if the language be accommodated to us, then it must convey to us the same idea, that we generally attach to such language, or it is no accommodation! So much, to accommodate this very accommodating objection.

But if *grieving*, and *repenting*, because applied to God, are to be understood as signifying something entirely different from what they do when applied to man; then how ought we to understand the text: (if we could find it,) "God foreknew from all eternity, whatsoever cometh to pass!" We must not understand it to signify what it says, by any means; but give it my friend's accommodated meaning, which is, to make it signify the exact opposite of what it says! We could thus prove, according to my opponent's logic, that God did not know from all eternity any thing that cometh to pass. One text with respect to God's foreknowledge should be just as accommodating as another! Again: if the *grief* and *repentance* of God be entirely different from the *grief* and *repentance* of man, then I contend, that when the bible says: "God is *good* unto all," the word *good*, on the same principle, is to be understood in an accommodated sense, as signifying something altogether different from its common acceptation. Hence we can draw no definite conclusion from the *goodness* of God; for we know not what it signifies, since it must be accommodated to the

logic of my opponent! As all such words, when applied to God, cannot mean what they do when applied to man, we cannot tell, therefore, but that the *goodness* and *mercy* of God will damn the whole human family, rather than save them! I might admit, with all safety, the logic of my friend, and challenge him to prove the salvation of any body, from the attributes of God; for all language, when applied to God, he tells us, is to be understood out of its common signification. Thus he is used up, let him take which ground he will.

[Alpha here interrupted the speaker, and said:] I wish, gentlemen moderators, to correct a mistake into which my friend has fallen. I do not contend that language, when applied to God, is to be understood as meaning exactly the reverse of what it says, the way my opponent represents me: but I understand it to be used in an infinitely greater sense. For example: when we read that God *loves* all men, I understand his love, not as being the opposite of ours, but as being exercised in an infinitely greater degree!

[Omega proceeds.]

Very good: I am glad my friend explained himself; for we can now understand the text which says: God *repented* that he had made man, and it *grieved* him at the heart. It is not to be understood as being different from the *grief* and *repentance* of man, but simply that his *grief* and *repentance* was infinitely the greatest!! Now if the sins of men caused *infinite grief*, then they are infinite offences, and consequently deserve infinite punishment!! I hope my friend will explain again.

One of two positions must be taken here; either of which plucks up the doctrine of my opponent by the roots. We are compelled either to take the ground, that the foregoing phrases, such as *knowing*, *loving*, *grieving*, *repenting*, &c., mean the same when applied to God, that they do when applied to man; or that they do not. If they do, then my position is clearly made out, that God did not foreknow from all eternity whatsoever cometh to pass; for this, as I have shown, the bible

repeatedly affirms. But if we take the position that they do not mean the same, that they do when applied to man, then we cannot tell what they do mean; and consequently, as all such matters, connected with God, are incomprehensible, we cannot therefore draw any definite conclusion in favor of universal salvation from what we know of God; neither can we present any rational argument against the doctrine of God having power to limit his knowledge, since we know not what the word *knowledge*, or *power*, signifies when applied to him!

But he brings his speech to a close, by an appeal to the sympathies of his audience. Such *ad captandum* logic is generally resorted to, and found more successful in advocating the cause of my opponent, than any testimony that can be adduced from the word of God. He has given us an awful representation of endless misery! He speaks of "ceaseless torture,"—"irretrievable ruin,"—"endless torment,"—"interminable wo," &c., &c., in order to make the audience horrified at the idea;—just as if that were any argument in favor of universal salvation. But I have three or four considerations to present, relative to this matter: and in the first place, I would inform my opponent, and all present, that I have not come here to advocate "endless misery," or any other affirmative; but simply to oppose Universalism.—Hence I am not bound to defend "ceaseless torture," but my business is, to show this audience, that the arguments of my opponent do not prove universal salvation! This I conceive to have been effectually done, since the commencement of this discussion.

But my friend appears to think, that should he succeed in putting down "endless misery," it proves universal salvation! This, however, does not follow, as the only alternative, by any means. There can be as plausible arguments adduced, in favor of the position, that the wicked will never be raised from the dead, as can be presented in favor of Universalism. Paul labored, as he declared, "If by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." [Phil. 3. 11.] The Saviour

speaks of those "who shall be accounted worthy to obtain—the resurrection of the dead." [Luke 20. 35.]—From this testimony it might be argued, with all the plausibility of Universalism, that the wicked would not enjoy the resurrection, because they did not labor to obtain it, and hence, they would neither be saved nor suffer "endless misery."

Again: It might be argued, and Universalists, according to their own doctrine, can be compelled to admit the same, that the wicked will be raised from the dead, and utterly destroyed or annihilated! Paul says concerning them: "Whose *end* is destruction." [Ph. 3. 19.] It might be asked: How can their *end* be destruction, unless they come to an *end*? And how can they come to an *end*, unless they are annihilated; or unless they "*utterly perish*," as says the apostle Peter; or how can they *live*, after they die "*the second death*." [Rev. 21. 8.] How, it might be asked, can the punishment of the wicked be compared to the burning up of "*chaff*,"—"*tares*,"—"*dry branches*,"—"*hay, wood, stubble*,"—"*thorns and briers*,"—and they be always burning, and never burn up?—[Math. 3. 12; 13. 40. John 15. 6. 1 Cor. 3. 15. Heb. 6. 8.] Would there be any similarity between endless misery, and the burning up of *chaff*? The whole fraternity of Universalists contend, that the destruction of *death*, and the *devil*, signifies their utter annihilation!—that *death*, and the *devil* will no longer *exist*, after Christ destroys them! Now as the same *being* is to destroy the wicked, who is to destroy death and the devil; and as they are to be destroyed at the same time, and in the same place,—"the lake of fire and brimstone," (Rev. 20,) will it not be the same destruction; and, according to Universalism, will not wicked men, as well as *death* and the *devil* be *annihilated*? They certainly will, which disproves universal salvation, and is not "ceaseless torment" either! But Universalists will tell us, that the destruction of the wicked, is simply their destruction as such, that is, the destruction of their sins! But stop: whatever is *destroyed* is punished. "Who shall be

ished with everlasting *destruction*." [2 Thes. 1. 9.] t the *man* who is punished, or his *sins*? The *man* ainly; and hence my opponent is compelled, accord- to his own theory, to admit that it is the man who is e annihilated! Thus he is completely driven, by his arguments, out of Universalism, and if he can't go horrifying theory of "endless torment," he can just over into "*destructionism*," and have a much more sistent theory to contend for, than the one he is now ocating.

ut, in the last place, I will take a position, and prove o, by the very logic of my opponent, that the wick- an suffer *endless torment*, and *rejoice* all the while! s being proved, away goes all the whining about aseless torture,"—"vindictive hatred,"—" inexorable lty," etc., etc. Let us see. My opponent has taken position, and argued it strongly, since this debate menced, that all men are punished in this life, all their sins deserve; and that they are punished every , as long as they continue to sin. Very good: let ow look at what the scriptures say, concerning the ked, who, according to Universalism, were at the e time suffering the "everlasting punishment" threat- d in the bible! We are informed, that they "*have* EASURE *in unrighteousness*,"—that they "ENJOY PLEASURES *of sin*,"—that they "*count it* PLEAS- E *to riot* in the day-time,—SPORTING *themselves h their own deceivings*,"—that they " DELIGHT *in* ;"—that " *their souls* DELIGHT *in their abomina- s*,"—and that they "REJOICE TO DO EVIL!!" [2 Thess. 2. 12. Heb. 11. 25. 2 Pet. 2. 13. Ps. 62. 4. Is. 3. Prov. 2. 14.] These individuals, let it be re- nbered, are all this while suffering punishment for r sins! Yes, according to Universalism, they are enduring the awful judgment threatened by Christ the apostles,—the damnation of hell; and all the le too, they have *pleasure*, they *sport*, they *rejoice o evil*, and *delight in lies and abominations!!!* A is always the best judge, as regards himself, whether

he feels *happy* or *miserable!* Now suppose you offer a helping hand to one of those conscience-seared bloats, who is now *delighting* in his *lies* and *abominations*, and *sporting* and *rejoicing* in the *pleasures of unrighteousness*, and he will tell you, he wants no better times, and desires no better company than he is now in! If you wish to make him feel wretched and miserable, make him think he is compelled to go to heaven, but if you wish to make his heart leap for joy, convince him from the bible that he is now in the very hottest hell there is, and that he will have to remain in it to all eternity, and your object is attained. Such fellows would hardly thank my opponent for preaching against such a hell as that! It is a great consolation to them, however, when they hear a talented Universalist combating the hell of orthodoxy! As an old *toper* once told a preacher, (when he saw he was about to *stall* upon the text: "These shall go away into everlasting punishment,") "Make it out if you can, Mr. T.—if you don't, I'm a gone sucker!"

Now permit me to ask my friend, and all Universalists present, whether it would be very "soul-benumbing," or "heart-withering," to think that such abandoned and profligate characters are doomed to suffer "endless punishment,"—or "ceaseless torture," when they are now in the very hottest of it, and "*enjoy*" it so well, that the highest and strongest motives of heaven and earth cannot induce them to leave it?! Does it "*benumb*" your *soul*, my dear sir, to think that they *enjoy* themselves so well now, and that they will continue to be tormented with such delightful punishment, as will make them "*rejoice*" to all eternity?! Singular logic, indeed, to be horrified at the idea of a sinner remaining eternally in a condition, which, if he could be induced to pray at all, would be his first and most fervent request! And would it be "vindictive hatred," and "inexorable cruelty," on the part of God, if he should confer upon the sinner that, which he desired above all things in heaven and earth?! All we go in for, is the punishment of the bible; and as

the sinner is now suffering that punishment, according to Universalism, and *rejoicing* at the same time, why should my opponent object, and why should he make such a tremendous fuss, because the sinner is destined thus to "*enjoy the pleasures of sin*" to all eternity?!

But he tries to tell us how long eternity is, and I confess he gets about as far into it, as I have ever seen any one go; yet it is no objection to endless misery, he is compelled to admit, as has just been demonstrated. But Universalists may be deceived, as regards sinners being punished here in time, and my opponent cannot but have serious doubts, I am confident, with reference to all men being saved in heaven. Now as heaven is a most glorious and desirable place, and if a man lose heaven he loses all, and as my opponent must admit, at least, that he may be wrong, and that there is a risk, in preaching Universalism, of the loss of heaven, both to himself and hundreds of others, hence, the *length* of eternity is against him, and not against us! O think of the sweets and joys of *endless felicity*, which my opponent is jeopardizing for himself and others, every time he preaches the untenable, at least doubtful theory of Universalism! Suppose we could enjoy more present happiness, if we all believed in Universalism, than we now do, (which is exceedingly doubtful,) then compare this paltry difference with the illimitable and inconceivable contrast between this short life, and boundless—shoreless e-t-e-r-n-i-t-y, and it follows, if there be but one probability in a *million* against Universalism, it utterly forbids any man to preach the doctrine? But how much greater is the hazard in preaching Universalism, when there is not one probability out of a million in its favor?!

I hope my opponent will remember the poetry he quoted from Dr. Somebody, and let that give him an idea of how much he risks, every time he preaches his doctrine! He enumerated all the blades of grass,—grains of sand,—drops of water,—rays of light,—stars of heaven, and leaves, buds, and blossoms of the forest, and even yet, he had not gone over the wall into the

suburbs of eternity! Let us try, if possible, to look still farther. Suppose all this countless number to be multiplied into itself as many times as it contains units, and this whole amount set down in as many different places as there are atoms of matter in the whole universe, the largest of which could not be observed through the finest magnifying glass;

Then add this number up without delay,
And mark the ages that have pass'd away:
Then set this number down *ten thousand* times,
Make each of these to head *ten thousand* lines:
Let every line *ten thousand* miles extend,
Make line and number each so closely blend
That microscope can not discern between,
Nor mark the distance that shall intervene:
Then strike a line below, and add again;
And take this mighty sum you thus obtain;
Make every unit stand for ages vast,
And wait until those ages long have past:
Then strike, and add as many millions more,
And still you have e-t-e-r-n-i-t-y 0☞ *before!*
There's none but God can know this mystery,
This awful, wondrous word ETERNITY!!

Thus you see, my audience, how much my opponent is hazarding whenever he preaches the system of Universalism, based as it is, and as he must see, upon a most flimsy and precarious foundation! How a man can possess the unblushing audacity, to put up his own vain philosophy and conjectures, in opposition, not only to more than nine-tenths of all christendom for eighteen centuries, but in opposition to the plain and unequivocal testimony of the bible; and at the same time run the risk of losing an e-t-e-r-n-i-t-y of felicity, with which the picture just presented bears no more resemblance, than the smallest conceivable *speck* compared with the entire universe of God! Let it be remembered, then, that whenever a Universalist attempts to portray the length of eternity, it

is against himself, and no objection to "*endless misery:*" as every Universalist is absolutely compelled to admit, that men may be *endlessly punished* and REJOICE all the while. I hope this will satisfy Universalists, and that we shall henceforth hear no more of their whining about "endless misery" and "ceaseless torment!"

I have already continued my speech longer than I had intended; but I felt it my duty to say something, in reply to the concluding part of my friend's address, from the consideration that such sympathetic appeals are generally resorted to, as a valuable substitute for bible testimony, and as a most excellent bait with which to catch the vulgar!

I hope you will ponder well the things you have heard, and reflect seriously upon the danger of embracing any theory, except the one proposed by Solomon: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man; for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." [Ec. 12. 13, 14.] May the Lord keep us from the snares and devices of the adversary, and preserve us blameless unto his heavenly kingdom!

CHAPTER X.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE PRO AND CON.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—Matt. 15. 18.

The Pro and Con of Universalism, by George Rogers, is undoubtedly the strongest work now extant, in defence of that doctrine; and its author is admitted to possess a greater amount of caution and foresight than any other advocate of the system, living or dead. I state these facts that the reader may see (when the gross absurdities, and outrageous blunders which the author has perpetrated, are laid out before him,) that the system is radically defective in itself—that it is *false*, or so many and such palpable contradictions would not, and could not, have occured in so small a work, (356 pages,) and under the dictation of so wise and prudent an author.

I calculate, in the following strictures, to study brevity, and give only samples enough from the work under review, to satisfy the intelligent reader that the cause of Universalism is not founded in truth, and that it carries its own refutation, engraven upon its very front. So far as the author of the work under review has relied on scriptural testimony in support of his peculiarities, it needs no examination here, as all such matters have been fully canvassed in the forgoing pages of this work. We

shall therefore proceed immediately to point out some of the *difficulties*, *absurdities*, and *contradictions* in which the Pro and Con has involved himself, in his infatuated endeavors to sustain the *difficult*, *absurd*, and *contradictory* system of Universalism.

He contends, as the first point to be noticed, that God is the author of sin.

"Believe me, reader, it is not possible to avoid the conclusion that *all events* take place agreeably to the *unalterable decrees of Jehovah*."—Page 300.

"The scriptures are most satisfactory, most philosophical upon this puzzling point, [the origin of sin;] they teach that 'of God are all things,'—they represent Jehovah himself as saying, 'I *form* the light and *create* darkness, I *make* peace and *create evil*, I the Lord do all these things.'"—p. 81.

"'So! then,' exclaims the Arminian objector, 'the author really seems bent on proving, that as Jehovah foreknew the existence of sin, he must also have *designed* it!' Yes, such is really my purpose."—p. 286.

"Having then, as I think, established the conclusion that absolute foreknowledge implies absolute foreordination, I proceed to notice the objections which seem to lie against it. I have already considered the most formidable of these, viz., that it makes God the author of sin; and I now ask, how, on any ground, is this to be avoided? I assert moreover that it is plainly scriptural."—p. 287.

This will suffice upon this point for the present. He here asserts, not only that God is "the author of sin," but he quotes and misapplies scripture, to prove that he *made* and *created* it just as he created "*light*" and "darkness." Bear this in mind, reader, and observe how it corresponds with the following:

"But in accommodation to our limited conceptions the retributive dispensations of his providence are termed his anger, because they display the *repugnance* of his *infinitely pure nature to all unholiness*" p. 121.

"If sin shall always exist, it will be owing either to a want of power in God to destroy it, or to a want of disposition. To the former it cannot be, for he is Almighty; neither can it be to the latter, for it is a *thousand times* declared in his word, in one form or other, that *sin is utterly odious to him*."—p. 61.

Then, sir, it is a "*thousand times* declared in his word that" Universalism is false; for how can God be the *au-*

thor of a thing, and form it by the creative act, as he formed *light*, and that thing be "*utterly odious to him?*" How can he be the author of all the wickedness in existence, and yet possess an "infinitely pure nature?" If God can be thus *pure*, and at the same time be the direct author, or *creator* of sin, then there is no danger of any man becoming *impure* by practicing it! And if one thing that God has created be "utterly odious to him," may not all his other works be equally repugnant to his infinitely pure nature; and if God will utterly destroy or annihilate one part of his *creation*, (which the Pro and Con asserts concerning sin,) and that part, too, which was designed for a good end, where is the proof then, that he will not utterly destroy any other, or all other parts of his creation; and especially the human family, who, the Pro and Con asserts, were designed like sin for "*some future purpose of goodness?*" (p. 103.) But if God is the author of all *wrong*, and has created all the sin that ever existed, then we cannot reasonably expect him to do that which is right at any future period, for he is without variableness or shadow of turning. This author asserts the same.

"Convince me that my maker can do what is *wrong*, or omit to do what is *right* at one time, and I shall at once despair of his doing otherwise at any time!"—p. 200.

Now the Pro and Con is necessarily compelled to admit that God will continue to do what is *wrong* to all eternity, or else deny that there is any thing *wrong* in the universe; for he has repeatedly affirmed, (as before quoted,) that God is the author and creator of all things universally! If an evasion be attempted by assuming that God created sin only as a temporary *wrong*, to be overruled for a good end, still it leaves the difficulty as bad as ever; for we may expect him to do the same thing at any other, and at all other times, and thus he may continue to create sin and misery to all eternity for a good end! How will they ever be destroyed, according to this? Finally: if sin originated, or had its well-spring in the eternal God, as the Pro and Con teaches, then it

will be absolutely eternal in its duration, for he asserts that

"Moreover life must be *absolutely eternal*, having its well-spring in the eternal God."—p. 187.

So much for God being the author of sin. But this is not the worst of it. The doctrine inculcated by the work under examination must necessarily, and inevitably encourage men to commit sin. This I will now prove. In the first place it is most reasonable to suppose that sin cannot be a very dangerous thing, since God went to the pains of foreordaining it; but viewing it as the Pro and Con does, it is far preferable to virtue—most salutary and glorious in its result, and must necessarily prompt every rational man to have as much of the article on hand as possible. Reader, this is no fiction; if you suspect it such, read the following:

"That God has no pleasure in sin for its own sake is clear, for it is opposed to his nature—but that God does will its existence, for the present, and with reference to ☞ *some future purpose of goodness*, it were the essence of folly to deny, for otherwise it would not be."—p. 103.

"Love can approve of all things as they are, because it looks forward to what they are to be; it can approve of present evil with a view to *future* and *greater good;* it can smile upon a short night of *tears*, which is to issue in an ever-enduring day of joy, ☞ *the brighter for those tears!*"—p. 126.

"Of all people on earth, we have the least reason for being dissatisfied with the present life; for according to our view, all its sorrows, temptations, trials, disappointments, &c., are appointed by infinite love, to exercise us here *for our hereafter advantage*."—p. 151.

"Truth is, our Creator has designed that this existence should be one of partial suffering—moral as well as physical suffering; and in appointing the end he has also appointed the means. *Sin* is the *main means*, by which the former is brought on.—All this, I know, would reflect no glory upon the Creator's character, but for the fact—the glorious heart-cheering fact, that out of all this shall issue an universally benevolent result: 'our light afflictions,' [sin and its consequent misery,] 'which are but for a moment, worketh for us ☞ *a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*.'"—p. 297.

"The tiger is loose, (by which I would personate sin and misery,) whether by appointment or permission you must see that the divine

character is equally concerned in the event. Shall it roam and make havoc amongst God's offspring forever? or shall it be destroyed—the wounds it has inflicted be healed, and the subjects of its violence be brought to see and experience, that, all things considered, *it was better* for them to have suffered from its fury for a time, ☞ *that* THEREBY *their* HAPPINESS *might be* ENHANCED FOR ETERNITY."—p. 312.

Here you have it, reader; not only that sin was designed for a good end, but that it will "*enhance our happiness for eternity!*" Who, then, would not desire as much sin as possible, seeing it is "*for our hereafter advantage,*" and will result in "*greater good,*" than we could have possibly experienced without its "*means?*" But the Pro and Con tries to avoid this difficulty.

"He who sins most, has most moral suffering: God has joined these two things together, and no man can put them assunder. The reader will therefore learn not to plead this doctrine as an excuse for sinning the more, for, so sure as he does so, *he must suffer the more.*"—p. 297.

If I believed "this doctrine," I should not only plead it "as an excuse for sinning the more," but I should feel it my imperative duty, as I loved myself, and desired happiness, to embrace every possible opportunity of practicing wickedness: and if it should cause me to shed *tears* of sorrow and regret, I would rejoice in such suffering, knowing that it would ultimately "*issue in an ever-enduring day of joy,* ☞THE BRIGHTER FOR THOSE TEARS."☜ Why should not I desire sin, since thereby my "*happiness* would be *enhanced* for *eternity?*" and why should I not desire, and earnestly crave the *sufferings* which will result from sin, since the Pro and Con has given us the assurance that this *light affliction* which is but for a moment, will work out for us "*a far more exceeding, and eternal weight of glory?*" Thus, if the doctrine of the Pro and Con be true, we have *infinite motives* held out, as inducements to practice sin, rather than holiness. But as sin is "utterly odious to God," and nevertheless will *enhance* our *happiness* for *eternity,* it follows that this eternal happiness must also be "*utterly odious*" to him, as the stream cannot rise

higher than the fountain, and the effect cannot exceed the cause that produced it. Hence, as sin will be destroyed, this eternal happiness will go along with it. But, according to the Pro and Con, sin must necessarily continue to all eternity, in order to keep up this eternal happiness. See the following:

"The soul (by which I mean the moral nature) is so constituted, that none of the affections thereof can be exercised forever, without a *perpetual action of the exciting cause!* They may be compared to fires, which will burn out in time ☞ *except new fuel be added:* or to springs whose waters will exhaust, ☞ *except kept up by constant new supplies.* Take, for instance, the affection of *joy;* you know, that to however rapturous a degree it may be excited, it will *subside at length*, unless it be ☞ *renewed by fresh objects.*"—pp. 252–3.

Now as sin is to enhance our happiness for eternity, it is most evident that sin itself must necessarily endure to eternity; for he informs us that the affection of *joy* or *happiness* "will subside at length unless *renewed by fresh objects.*" It will go out, like fire, "*except new fuel be added;*" or this happiness which is the result of sin and misery, like springs of water, will exhaust, "except kept up by *constant new supplies,*" or by "a *perpetual action of the exciting cause.*" If this does not prove that sin and misery must endure eternally, off and on, as we sometimes say, then nothing can be made apparent by the English language. Once more upon this point

"To the first question I reply, that sin, though odious in itself, may yet, as overruled by the divine Being, be made to eventuate in a *greater good* than could be effected *without its means.* I say not that God appointed it *to that end;* but that he will so overrule it that such will be the result. How otherwise can his permitting its existence be vindicated?"—p. 62.

After stating that sin will "be made to eventuate in a *greater good*, than could be effected without its *means,*" he makes this declaration which I wish the reader particularly to notice: ☞ "I say not that God *appointed it to that end.*" Now one of two things must follow inevitably, since God did not appoint sin to a *good end*, either he did not *appoint* it at all, or he appointed it to a bad end. If the Pro and Con meant that God did not

appoint sin at all, but simply *permitted* it, (which is quite evident from his language,) then he contradicts himself most pointedly. In replying to the Armenian objection, that Universalism makes God the author of sin, he remarks:

"We make him the author of all things, indeed;—It can make no actual difference between us in this respect, that you say God *permits*, while *we say he* APPOINTS, for the result is the same in both cases."—pp. 311-12.

Here he gives us his real views, (I presume,) that God did actually *appoint* sin, but as he did not appoint it to a *good* end, he must therefore have *appointed* it to a *bad* end; and thus God is not only disappointed in having sin result in good, when he appointed it for the opposite, but he is proved to be a cruel tyrant; for if he created and appointed one thing to a bad end, we cannot possibly infer, with any degree of propriety, but that he created all other things with the same design. But again: According to the argument of the Pro and Con it is perfectly *reasonable* and consistent for sin and misery to exist in the eternal state of being. This I will prove.

"I believe that this view obtains very generally amongst the Unitarians of this country, and the author will confess it is that to which his own judgment the most strongly inclines. The only objection (so far as I know) to which it is liable, is, that it represents Jehovah as *partial*, in making some of his creatures to be *eternally superior to others*. But then it is admitted that some are actually made superior to others *in time*—superior in person, intellect, *fortune*—and moral qualities. Why not these facts, as well form a ground of impeachment against the impartiality of God as the other?"—p. 334.

Sure enough! The Pro and Con, after all his philosophising upon the unreasonableness of sin or punishment existing in eternity, now comes out, and proves that some men will "be eternally superior to others," from the fact that they are so here in time! and that it will not impeach the character of God for the same distinctions to exist between men in eternity that exist here in time! Truly this is a new way of defending Universalism. But hear him again:

"It is against reason, because from what is possible to us in our pres-

ent mode of being, it is *unreasonable* and *presumptuous* to infer with confidence, as to what is, or is not possible to *every conceivable mode of being*."—p. 343.

Hence it is *possible* and *reasonable* for men to be sinful and miserable in the eternal state of being, as much so as here; and the Pro and Con has demonstrated himself to be one of the most "unreasonable and presumptuous" men on earth, because he has, in a number of cases, inferred most positively and dogmatically, that it was not reasonable nor possible for sin and misery to exist in the future state! But here he kills his doctrine at a single blow, by admitting that it is reasonable and possible for sin and misery to exist in the future state, from the fact that they exist here. Once more:

"We here experience that *effort* is the price of all *attainment*, both *moral* and *intellectual*—that all *advancement*, as well as *retrogression*, is *progressive*. These things we know to be the case *at present*, and we have no *reason* for supposing that they will be *different with us*, when we enter upon a *new stage of existence!*"—p. 346.

"Yes, "all *advancement*, as well as *retrogression*, is *progressive*." Look at this sentence. Some men *advance* in virtuous improvement as long as they live, whilst "evil men and seducers wax *worse* and *worse*," or *progress* in retrogradation. This is true: and as "we have no reason for supposing it will be different with us, when we enter upon a new stage of existence," it follows that the retrogression of the wicked will be progressive eternally;—they will continue to "wax worse and worse," whilst the righteous will continue to advance in moral improvement forever and ever. How, then, will the Pro and Con get the wicked saved, if they continue in the future state in their *retrograde progression*?

"Nevertheless, as 'one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the *ressurrection of the dead*.' It seems anything but *reasonable* to suppose that there will be no difference at that era, betwixt Paul, (for example,) and the individual who passed from time without having taken the first step in *moral advancement*."—p. 346.

Thus we discover that there will be the same difference between men at the resurrection, in point of "*mo-*

ral advancement," that there is now! Then it follows, as some men are entirely destitute of moral qualification here, that they will be destitute of it there, or in other words, they will be just as destitute of holiness in the resurrection as they are here in time. They will, therefore, be raised unholy, and consequently in their sins! But again:

"Our souls (like gardens in nature) *cannot* be got into a condition of yielding the fruits of the Spirit in any great degree of excellency or abundance, without *sedulous* and *persevering cultivation*."—p. 346.

Then of course, since some men will continue in the future state to progress in wickedness, as we have seen, it follows that *their souls* will never yield the fruits of the Spirit; for it is quite evident, if they continue to "wax worse and worse" in eternity, as they do here in time, (which the Pro and Con asserts,) that their souls will never come under the influence of very "*sedulous and persevering cultivation*."

But according to his views of the immutability of God, it must necessarily follow that God will punish some men to all eternity. Reader, mark me, if this be not so.

"The *mutability* of God is manifestly implied in the common supposition, that although he will bear with the provocations of sinners during the term of their stay on earth, yet so soon as they are removed hence, he will utterly alter his course, and let loose his vengeance upon them without mercy."—p. 55.

Now observe reader, that according to this argument, it makes out God a *mutable* or *changeable* being, if he should do one thing with a sinner in *time*, and do differently with him in eternity!! This makes God changeable! Yes; and hence, according to the Pro and Con, God is unchangeable, and consequently will continue to do with sinners in eternity whatever he does in time. This is his argument without exaggeration. Now does it not follow that God will continue to punish wicked men eternally, since, according to Universalism, he punishes them as long as they live on earth, and he is unchangeable!! Thus the Pro and Con is compelled to admit, according to his own logic, that the wicked will have to endure endless punishment.

We shall now examine his views on punishment.

"Punishment is of two kinds as to its nature,—several, as to its objects. One kind may be termed *arbitrary*,—the other *necessary*. *Arbitrary* punishment is such as results from the *mere will of the punisher*; it has *no natural connection with the offense*. *Necessary* punishment is such as necessarily proceeds from the sin itself; it is an unavoidable consequence of it. In the one, an *outward executioner* is required; in the other, *sin is its own executioner*. The stroke of the one may therefore be dodged; the stroke of the other is as inevitable as fate.—Hence it will be seen, that between murder and hanging there is no *natural connection*. The connection is *arbitrary*, hence its *uncertainty*. Now let us see whether *divine punishment* can be thus *evaded*."—pp. 242–3.

We *will* "*see*," sir, and will prove by *yourself*, that every thing you have said in this connection against "*arbitrary* punishment," as you define it, casts most impious reflections upon the character and government of God! I say I will prove it by *yourself!* Reader, before proceeding, please turn back, and read this last quotation again, and mark particularly those words in *italics*.—You will discover that "*arbitrary* punishment" is the opposite of "*necessary*," and consequently *unnecessary*.—Mark this! Then observe that "arbitrary punishment" "has *no natural connection with the offense*,"—"results from the mere will of the punisher," and needs "*an outward executioner*." Hence he concludes that "*hanging*," or any other punishment which needs "an outward executioner" is *arbitrary*,—*unnecessary*, and having "no natural connection with the offense!" But has not God, in numerous instances, inflicted *arbitrary* punishment? Most certainly. Was not the fire and brimstone, which God poured down upon the Sodomites "an *outward executioner?*" Was not the flood upon the antediluvians?—the Red Sea upon the Egyptians?—the sword of Joshua upon the Canaanites, and the Roman soldiers upon Jerusalem? Were not these *outward executioners*? The man who was pelted with stones, for breaking the sabbath, by the express directions of the Almighty,—who "*died without mercy* under two or three witnesses," had he not an outward executioner? What say you reader?

If so, was it not "*arbitrary* punishment" according to the Pro and Con? But I said I would prove it from *himself*, and here it is!

"I do not affirm that in the administration of the divine government, *arbitrary punishments* have never occurred; in scripture times it would seem, the divine dealings with men were more direct and visible than they have since been. In those days, *outward* and *sensible expressions of his displeasure* against sin, sometimes occurred; as in the deluge, the destruction of Sodom, Babylon, Tyre, Sidon, and Jerusalem."—p. 245.

Here, then, we have it, that God has, on various occasions, inflicted "*arbitrary punishment*," and ergo, has inflicted such punishment as is *unnecessary*, and which "has no natural connection with the offence!" Now as God has inflicted arbitrary and *unnecessary* punishment, (according to this author,) upon some of the transgressors of his law, will he not, if he be impartial and immutable, inflict similar punishment upon all transgressors? The Pro and Con shall answer:

"Now it is absolutely pitiful, yea, contemptible, to give to passages of this nature a *partial* application, as if Jehovah does not in his dealings with *each* and *all of the transgressors of his law, observe the same eternal principles of mercy and justice*."—p. 247.

May I not add, that "it is absolutely pitiful, yea, contemptible," for the Pro and Con to argue as he does:—first come out and ridicule and lampoon the idea of "arbitrary punishment," as being calculated to encourage crime; in the second place acknowledge that God had adopted this very ridiculous scheme of "arbitrary punishment," in a number of instances; and last of all, contend that God must necessarily "*observe the same eternal principles*," in punishing "*each* and *all* of the transgressors of his law," which will be to inflict "arbitrary punishment" upon every individual who dies in his sins!!—Hence, as hundreds and thousands of wicked men have gone into eternity with no punishment except remorse of conscience, which the Pro and Con terms "*necessary punishment*," and which I have shown in a former chapter to be no punishment at all, it follows that such characters will receive arbitrary punishment at the

hand of God in the *eternal* world, as certain as he is immutable, and deals with all upon the same *eternal principles!* The Pro and Con himself admits, as before quoted, that God does not now, in this dispensation, inflict "arbitrary punishment," as he did in "scripture times," as he expresses it: and I really believe the man thinks he has got entirely out of *scripture times*, from the shere indifference with which he treats the bible. He tells us that arbitrary punishment, which God inflicted upon the Sodomites, &c., is called his "strange work."—p. 245. But *strange* as it is, this very Pro and Con tells us, that the calamity which befell the Sodomites was no more than a "*suitable distinction*" between the righteous and the wicked!—pp. 262–3.

Now if God made a "suitable distinction" between the righteous and wicked, by pouring down fire and brimstone upon the latter, who, as the apostle teaches, suffered "the vengeance of *eternal fire*," will not such a distinction be required in the future state, seeing we have no such distinction now, and since God will deal upon the same eternal principles, "with each and all of the transgressors of his law!" Now since the Pro and Con is compelled to admit that God will inflict "arbitrary punishment" in the eternal world, can that punishment be endless misery? Yes, for he tells us that such is "arbitrary punishment." Will you hear it?

"Can any body see any necessary, any reasonable connection between the eating of an interdicted apple, and the suffering in ceaseless fire? It is not even pretended by those who take *this view* of the subject, that the penalty threatened was otherwise than *arbitrary*."—p. 245.

"For is it pretended that between the sinful acts of men, and their suffering in ceaseless fire, there is any necessary connection? If not, then the penalty is *arbitrary*."—p. 73.

Take notice; Jesus Christ is to "execute judgment," and consequently to be the "*executioner*," under the present dispensation, as all the apostles have taught. This proves that all punishment for sin is *arbitrary*, and none of it that "*necessary* punishment," of which the Pro and Con speaks, for he positively teaches, as already quoted,

that in such punishment, "*sin is its own executioner.*" Hence, it must be evident, that this is not the punishment of the New Testament, for Christ is the *executioner* of that! But hear him again:

"Have punishments a *reforming tendency?* If they have not, then must it be admitted that they are *useless;* for they cannot repair the injury done by the offender; they do not *prevent others from committing the same offense.*"—p. 242.

Observe, reader, that if punishment has any other design, except the *reformation of the offender*, it is "*useless,*" and hence, it must have but *one object!* This, the above quotation plainly teaches. Now for a contradiction.—Take notice, that the one, and only *object* of punishment is *reformation.* On the same page he declares that "punishment is of *two kinds* as to its nature, ☞ *several, as to its* OBJECTS." Now if *reformation* be the only *object* of punishment; where, I ask, does he find his "*several objects?*" But hear him again: After admitting (as before quoted) that God had inflicted "arbitrary punishments," in the case of Sodom, Babylon, Jerusalem, &c., he remarks:

"It is not pretended that in this class of punishments, the *reformation of the punished* is the immediate object; they are meant as *examples to others*, and therefore they are *benevolent*, although not directly so to the *subjects themselves.*"—p. 245.

In the above quotation he contends that if punishments be not for the *reformation* of the offender, it is "useless." Then, of course, God inflicted useless punishment upon the Sodomites, and hence the fact of endless misery being "useless," as the Pro and Con argues, is no proof that God will not inflict it! But he admits that the punishment of the Sodomites was "MEANT AS AN EXAMPLE TO OTHERS," and of course to prevent others from committing the same offence. In this he agrees with the apostle Jude; but in agreeing with him, he contradicts himself, for he declares in one of the above quotations, that punishments "DO NOT PREVENT OTHERS FROM COMMITTING THE SAME OFFENSE," and hence he concludes that they are "useless," if they have any other "*object*" except the REFORMATION OF THE OFFENDER!

If this be not a jumble of contradictions, then I know not what is.—But more about this "reforming tendency."

"But *why* should we be censured and *punished* for *sin*, if its commission be but the result of foreordination? You are answered, reader, so soon as you *answer* yourself, *why* you *crush* with detestation the odious reptile under your foot, when you know that it cannot help being the reptile that it is."—p. 297.

I answer, that I do not "crush the odious reptile under my foot" for its reformation, certainly; neither does George Rogers, but simply to get it out of the way: hence, as God punishes the sinner for the same object, he does not therefore punish him for his good, but for the good of others!

But should the Pro and Con design to be understood as teaching that the reformation of the Sodomites was the *remote object* of their destruction, as he appears to intimate by the statement, that their reformation was not the "*immediate object*," still it leaves a serious difficulty; for he there teaches that the "immediate object" of their punishment was to give us an "example," and as the *remote* object, must be farther distant than the *immediate* one, it follows that their reformation is not yet effected! And as they have been in eternity nearly 4000 years without reformation, it is quite probable that they will not be reformed till the resurrection; and if the resurrection reforms them, it will not be their punishment, and hence the great *design*, which the Pro and Con holds out as the *only* design of punishment, was not included in their case, neither *immediately* nor *remotely!* But if God reformed the Sodomites by their destruction, when all moral means failed, is it not our duty to kill every man that will not be influenced by the gospel, since we are to be instrumental in reforming the world? Next comes the judgment.

"I cannot be persuaded, my hearers, that the doctrine of a judgment after death has been productive of any benefit to mankind; whatever tends to encourage the impression that the retributions of guilt are distant, and uncertain as distant—*must necessarily be pernicious in its influence*."—p. 218.

This, reader is a fair specimen of the Pro and Con.—

A judgment that is *distant* and *uncertain*, is "pernicious in its influence." Then, according to this, Christ and the apostles taught a most pernicious and licentious doctrine; for the "everlasting punishment,"—"eternal damnation,"—"fiery indignation,"—"everlasting fire,"—"unquenchable fire," &c., &c., with which they threatened the wicked, were all *distant*—yes, *distant* to the destruction of Jerusalem!! And they were as "uncertain as distant," for the wicked Jews could have sinned on, till just before that judgment, and then have committed suicide, and escaped safely to heaven. Or the very murderers of Jesus Christ could have continued in their wickedness until just before this calamity occurred, and then embraced christianity; and the Pro and Con informs us that not one christian perished in that seige. Thus also they might have escaped, and thus the wicked had TWO CHANCES of escape from the "judgment day" of Universalism, whilst they have but ONE CHANCE to escape the future and "eternal judgment" of the apostles, and that is, by a reformation of life. And can a doctrine be pernicious in its influence which holds out an "eternal judgment," from which there is no escape but by submitting to God's law? The Pro and Con should remember that "they who live in glass houses should not throw stones at their neighbors." He quotes Solomon to prove that the wicked will take advantage of this doctrine. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." [Ec. 8. 11.] It is true the wicked *may* take advantage of this doctrine, but the fact that they have no lease of their lives, and not knowing what instant they may be struck dead, and knowing also, that if they die in their sins, their destiny is eternally fixed, no man, therefore, except one who is given over to hardness of heart, and a reprobate mind, would risk his eternal all, if he firmly believed this doctrine; and if he had become thus depraved, there is no probability of his ever reforming, if he should take advantage of this doctrine, and hence will meet with that awful doom at last. The

Pro and Con should be the last man to talk about the wicked taking advantage of the doctrine of a future judgment when he is inculcating a doctrine which is calculated in every way to console a wicked man, and encourage him to continue in his sins, with the absolute certainty, that they shall all be overruled for his good, and will *enhance his happiness for eternity!* The most palpable subterfuge, to which the Pro and Con resorts, is, that the penalty of Universalism is absolutely certain, and from it there is no possible escape. I have noticed this in another part of this work, (chap. 7,) but will here remark, that we believe, as much as do Universalists, that from remorse of conscience, (all the punishment Universalism holds out,) there is no possibility of escaping until the conscience becomes *seared*, and hence we have all the punishment for which Universalists contend, and just as certain too, as it is with them, and in addition to this, we hold out an eternal penalty, which the sinner is assured, will be as certainly inflicted, unless a reformation of life takes place before death. Thus we have the advantage of the Pro and Con, every way it can be turned. Suppose, as Solomon says, that the hearts of the wicked will be bent in them to do evil, because the penalty against an evil work was not executed speedily, would it not be worse, if, when the penalty was inflicted, they would know nothing about it? which is absolutely the case, as regards the penalty of Universalism, with perhaps three fourths of all the wicked on earth!—When Noah (the preacher of righteousness) was proclaiming to the antediluvians, that in a Hundred and Twenty Years a most dreadful calamity would come upon them, if, they did not repent;—the Pro and Con would have informed him, had he been there, that he was preaching a most "pernicious,"—most licentious doctrine, in putting the judgment off so far! And would, no doubt, have challenged him to a discussion of his orthodox principles: and yet, that old orthodox Noah preached nothing but what the Almighty had directed! Hear him again:

"The Jews deemed better of their God,—more philosophically—as all-seeing—all-pervading spirit—all just, and pure, and good—whose tribunal is in the bosom of every thinking being: what needs he of an external bar?—of books and witness, and other of the forms and ceremonies of trial? The Jewish scriptures sanction no such puerile representations of the infinite Jehovah. Shame to Christians, that they have copied the crude conceptions of heathenism?"—p. 216.

Truly this is wholesaling business with a rush! "The Jewish scriptures sanction no such puerile representations of the infinite Jehovah." This is not true, (leaving out the "puerile," for the Jewish scriptures inform us, that the Almighty himself, did require, in order to carry on his government, an "external bar," "books and witnesses;" and a man was brought before that "external bar," and his case was decided according to the "books" of Moses, which God had given, and which he had written with his own finger;) and "died without mercy under two or three *witnesses*." If God's "tribunal is in the bosom of every thinking being," and he has no need of "*books*," why did he give us the Old and New Testaments? If the Almighty had no more need of those books than the Pro and Con has, then surely he would never have been to the trouble of making them!

What a "puerile" and ridiculous thing it was, for the Israelites to sprinkle the blood of the paschal lamb upon their door-lintals, that the "infinite Jehovah," when he came down that night to slay the Egyptians, might not make a mistake and hit upon the wrong ones!!! "Shame to you, Moses, that you have copied the crude conceptions of heathenism." It is really time, in all gravity, that such scepticism, especially among professed believers, was done away with. And the Pro and Con does absolutely repent of it, when he gets over towards the close of his book.

"I am *sick* of this hypercritical *scepticism*, [good!!!] which is ever directing its vulture glance to the ☞ *spying out of difficulties* in every thing *proposed to its faith*, and *rejecting*, [just as you did, sir!] with *self complacent decisiveness* all that comes not within the *narrow compass of its apprehension!*"—p. 344.

No wonder the man got sick of "this hypercritical

scepticism," for whoever reads the three hundred and forty pages of his book preceding this quotation, if he does not find enough of that commodity to make any reasonable man *sick*, then I'll give up! Universalism and scepticism are so near identical, that let a Universalist preach many of his peculiarities in an infidel neighborhood where he was not known, and he would be claimed as a fellow-helper by all the Deists in the audience. The author of the Pro and Con, in his "MEMORANDA," gives an incident of his labors, which proves this assertion:

"Returning to Delhi, I had a less pleasant meeting than *before*. I then discovered that the principal men of the town were sceptics, of the Owen School, and that they had mistaken me to be of similar sentiments."—p. 102.

He however proceeded, as he tells us on the next page, to correct their mistake, and accordingly pointed out the difference between Universalism and Scepticism, and in conclusion he informs us that "this address was respectfully received by the audience." No wonder, for they were all Deists, and they are the very men who will receive Universalism with "all readiness of mind," as the best cloak for their infidelity! Hence, you hardly ever find an avowed infidel where Universalism flourishes. The latter is the most popular of the two, and hence names are shifted, which is the only thing requisite in making sceptics converts to Universalism! This same author in his "MEMORANDA" bears me out also in this statement:

"In any community, of which Universalists compose a considerable portion, you shall invariably find fewer infidels, [i. e. AVOWED infidels,] than where orthodox forms of religion have exclusive sway."—p. 107.

This can all be accounted for, without admitting Universalism to be either true or reasonable, neither of which it is, most assuredly!

Speaking, in the same work, of young Universalist preachers opposing orthodoxy, and showing off their "smartness" by lampooning CREEDS, spurred onward by the "smiles," "nods," and "grins," of the audience, makes the following very true remark:

"But ah, me! how little worth is this sort of incense? [these signs of approval.] From whom comes it in general? From the wise? the good? the sincere? the lover of Christ's cause?—Seldom from either. More generally, rather, from those who would *applaud Paine's ribaldries at the expense of all religion*."—p. 397.

Now does not the reader know, if he has ever heard a SMART Universalist preacher declaim against orthodoxy, that the whole audience of Universalists, little and big, will cheer him up with just such "smiles," "grins," and "nods," which this author testifies to come, not from the WISE, the GOOD, the SINCERE, or the LOVER OF CHRIST'S CAUSE; but from "those who would APPLAUD PAINE'S RIBALDRIES AT THE EXPENSE OF ALL RELIGION." From this it is evident that nineteen twentieths of all Universalists are infidels at heart,—neither WISE, GOOD, SINCERE, NOR LOVERS of CHRIST'S CAUSE! A poor recommendation truely!

"'What can we reason but from what we know?' the Poet asks; and from all that we can know at present, the probabilities seem decidedly *against* the supposition, that it is *possible* for Jehovah to create sentient creatures who, from the commencement of their existence, shall be in possession of absolute and unmixed felicity; it seems a fair presumption, that, *were it possible*, his infinite goodness *would have so created* and *circumstanced them*, that to all eternity, all creatures should be utter strangers to *want*, or *pain*, or *so anything which would render their happiness incomplete*."—p. 327.

Now, reader, take notice;—the Pro and Con has absolutely come out, and acknowledged that it was not *possible* for God to create man and keep him from being sinful and miserable, and that if he *could* have done it, he *would* have so created him, that he would to all eternity be an entire stranger to everything like *want*, or *pain*, or *anything* that would render his happiness incomplete. Well, since God could not *possibly* prevent sin and suffering from having an existence, how in the name of reason can he ever annihilate them, since his power can be no stronger at one time than at another? If God, in the creation could not make man so, but that he must necessarily be sinful and miserable, how can the

Pro and Con infer that God, who is without variableness or shadow of turning, will be able to better the matter in the resurrection? But upon this point also he *contradicts* himself.

"On this ground alone, as I conceive, [i. e. that sin shall result in good,] can the Almighty ruler of the universe be acquitted of folly or cruelty, in having permitted sin and suffering to enter the world—for ☞ *none are so* WEAK *as to suppose that he could not have had it otherwise!*"—p. 91.

Yes sir, you are just that "*weak*" yourself! and it is my candid belief that you do not know what you do believe, or by what motives you are actuated. Do you think, reader, that I am too hard? If you do, read the following from the preface to his "MEMORANDA."

"When a man takes it upon himself to write his own history, he is, we may suppose, either moved thereto by a *propensity to egotism*, or *he* is persuaded that he is *fulfilling a duty to the public*.—With the former of these *motives* the author feels that he is liable to be *charged, with what truth God only knows; for he confesses that he himself does not!*"

But we pass on to notice about a dozen more contradictions. In trying to dispose of two texts of scripture, which he had brought up as objections to answer, [i. e. Dan. 12. 2.: John 5. 28, 29.] he gives us the following:

"It is granted that the above texts are *parallel*, but this very admission is fatal to the objection; for Christ has fixed the *time* of the event to which *they* refer, [*both*, mark it,] at the period of the *overthrow of the Jewish state*.—Thus much as regards the *time* of this resurrection, which, instead of being at the *end of the world*, as our opponent thinks, ☞ *is past by nearly eighteen centuries*."—pp. 221-2.

The reader will bear in mind that the resurrection spoken of in these two texts, "*is past by nearly eighteen centuries*," as was fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem, or, "*the overthrow of the Jewish state*." Now turn over only *one leaf* and read:

"On the whole then, it must, I think, be manifest to the enlightened reader, that the import of the *passages* before us is, that Christ, by the word of his gospel, and the ministry of his apostles, was about to call men forth from the graves of superstition and ignorance, in which they had long been buried.—*This important work had already begun in Christ's day*, [not at the *destruction* of *Jerusalem!*] but it was des-

tined soon to take effect upon a much wider scale, and, eventually, ☞ *it shall be* UNIVERSAL *in its extent!!*"—p. 224.

How a man can so flatly contradict himself within two pages, is wholly unaccountable, only upon the ground that he is endeavoring to defend an irreconcilable and contradictory system! First he tells us that it referred to the "overthrow of the Jewish state," as the time of its fulfillment, and then informs us that it was fulfilling "*in Christ's day!*" First tells us that it is past by nearly "eighteen centuries," and then informs us that "*eventually it* SHALL BE *universal in its extent.*" This, mark it, is his own language, "IT SHALL BE," which places this resurrection still in the future to us! and still it was fulfilled "nearly eighteen centuries" ago! If the Pro and Con can have a *universal* resurrection fulfilled "eighteen centuries" ago, may not his *universal* salvation be all over with, ever since the destruction of Jerusalem, and all who have since lived be eternally lost?! But if the Pro and Con would prefer the name of contradicting himself, rather than to have his universal salvation *end* at the "overthrow of the Jewish state," he may have it so; and then it follows, that, as this resurrection is to be "universal," it will embrace the Sodomites and antediluvians, which proves it to refer to the *literal* resurrection; and thus the Pro and Con is unavoidably compelled to admit that in the literal resurrection some shall come forth "*to the resurrection of damnation!*" Hard, I know, but it is fair! It is a trap of his own setting. But when Christ speaks of "graves," "resurrection," *coming forth*, etc., he does not mean what he says, according to the Pro and Con: no, he means something altogether different! Mark this, and read again:

"I sincerely thank my friend for the conciseness and explicitness of his objections; it shall not be the fault of my will if my replies are not equally concise and explicit. 1st. He grants the grammatical correctness of the criticism on the text, which makes nations (not individuals) the parties arraigned and separated in the judgment that it *foretells*; yet he thinks Christ could not have designed what his *language fairly means! This*, in effect, is to accuse him of not having known how *to express his meaning!*"—pp. 179—180.

Yes, and George Rogers is the very man who has made out Christ just that ignorant, in his comment on John 5. 29, just examined! "Out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee." Again:

"It is a common practice to refer this passage to the literal termination of this world, but such is obviously not the scriptural meaning of the phrase 'end of the world;' it *never* requires such an *interpretation*, but on the contrary *invariably means* the *consummation* of the *Jewish economy!* Paul calls the *period* at which CHRIST DIED, 'the end of the world.' [Heb. 9. 26.]"—p. 170.

Hence "the *period* at which CHRIST DIED" was "the consummation of the *Jewish economy*," for he tells us that "the end of the world" does refer to Christ's death, and "INVARIABLY *means the consummation of the Jewish economy.*" Then, of course, when the disciples wished to know of the Lord what should be the "sign of his coming, and of the *end of the world*," (Math. 24. 3,) they referred to *his death!* Bear this in mind.

"Third: 'And of the end of the world?' This, however, is not properly a third question, but merely a member of the second: 'the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world,' (*tou aionos*) *end of the age* or *Mosaic economy;* for the disciples understood that the *destruction* of the *city* and *temple would close* the *Jewish dispensation.*"—p. 183.

This is so gross and palpable a contradiction, that the most superficial reader can discover it, without comment. Again: in commenting on 2 Pet. 3. 5-7, he admits that the antediluvians who were destroyed in the flood are yet to be destroyed by fire! Read what follows:

"Should it be objected, that, inasmuch as there is an allusion in the connection to the destruction of the old world by water, and it took place literally, therefore we ought to understand the predicted destruction by fire in a similar sense. I answer that in point of fact, the old world WAS NOT, ITSELF, destroyed by the deluge; ☞ THE INHABITANTS ONLY WERE DESTROYED—and the writer himself saith ☞ THE SAME WORLD IS KEPT IN STORE RESERVED UNTO FIRE."—p. 207.

Now as the *old world* which was destroyed, signifies the INHABITANTS, and as "the SAME WORLD is kept in store RESERVED UNTO FIRE," as the Pro and Con here testifies, it follows that the INHABITANTS, who were de-

stroyed in the flood are yet to be destroyed by FIRE; and this cannot be, as a matter of course, till the resurrection, when the antediluvians shall come forth "to the resurrection of damnation." Thus the Pro and Con admits that Peter is speaking of a judgment at the end of time! But now comes the contradiction:

"From the whole then it must be apparent to all my attentive hearers, that Peter is speaking of NO OTHER JUDGMENT than that which was to accompany the DISSOLUTION of the OLD COVENANT, and the USHERING IN of the NEW."—ibid.

And as the end of the old covenant, or the Jewish dispensation, was at the death of Christ, which the Pro and Con asserts, as already quoted, it follows that the whole of this judgment scene was past, when Peter penned this prediction, and yet the ignorant apostle knew no better than to put the matter off still in the future! We shall now notice his comment on the text, "And so *all Israel* shall be saved." Rom. 11. 26. You will observe that he quotes this text to prove the universal salvation of the Jewish nation, and hence must, as a necessary conclusion, understand "*all Israel*" to embrace those millions of the Jews who had already been dead and in eternity for hundreds of years.

"That Paul was not speaking of Israel in any such restricted sense, is exceeding obvious. 'All Israel shall be saved,' the SAME ISRAEL that were YET IN THEIR SINS, that 'WERE BLINDED,' that 'WERE ENEMIES TO THE GOSPEL,' that were ALL 'CONCLUDED IN UNBELIEF.' And this is to be effected when 'the fullness of the Gentiles be come in.'"—p. 117.

This proves that those wicked Jews who had fallen in the wilderness "*were yet in their sins*,"—"*were included in unbelief*," and "*were enemies to the gospel*." Consequently they had been suffering torment in the eternal world for nearly two thousand years, as the Pro and Con teaches, that sin and misery always go hand in hand! Does this look like all sin and suffering being confined to this life? Not hardly! But again:

"I choose to assume that man is in some degree master of his volitions, and the actions thence ensuing; that in many cases HE COULD BOTH WILL, AND DO, OTHERWISE THAN AS HE DOES."—p. 133.

Observe now how this will harmonize with the following:

"You must see, reader, that the notion of a FREE WILL is a CHIMERA."—p. 290.

"Believe me reader, that it is not possible to avoid the conclusion, that all events take place, agreeably to the unalterable decrees of Jehovah."—p. 300.

Now I ask common sense, how a man "could both *will* and *do* otherwise than as he does," if "the notion of a FREE WILL is a CHIMERA," and if "all events take place agreeably to the UNALTERABLE *decrees of Jehovah.*" Did God unalterably decree that man should do just as he does? Yes, if he decrees all events. Can man do differently from what he does? If so, then he can break "the *unalterable decrees* of Jehovah." If God had *unalterably decreed* all events, then it would be out of the question for a man to feel the least *responsibility* for his conduct, unless he thinks he has it in his power to break those "*unalterable decrees!*" Does the Pro Con think they can be broken? He does, as I will now prove:

"On the 5th the congregation were most imminently endangered by a storm which blew up, just as I had got through prayer. The storm which arose was one of wind, lightning, and hail; I confess that I felt a *fearful responsibility resting on me*, in having been the occasion of so many people being brought together in so dangerous a situation." "*Memoranda*," p. 321.

This is truly singular,—he "felt a *fearful responsibility* resting on him," for doing what God, from all eternity had *unalterably decreed* that he should do at that very time! and which he was no more to blame for, than he was for that storm coming up, since "the notion of A FREE WILL IS A CHIMERA!" Suppose that storm had blowed the house down, and killed Mr. Rogers and the whole audience, it would have been nothing to fret about, as *it*, too, would have been according to the unalterable decree of Jehovah! Why then feel a "fearful responsibility," let come what will? But more upon this point. It must, according to the Pro and Con, have been unalterably decreed from all eternity, that Christ should die at the very time he did!

"We find, indeed, that Jesus seized upon every fitting occasion for communicating these stupenduous matters to his countrymen, not, to be sure, in plain language, for they would not have borne it; he would thus have enraged them against him, and the catastrophe of his death would have been *hastened before* the other great objects of his mission were fulfilled."—p. 172.

"We are directly informed that 'the common people heard him gladly;' (Mark 12. 37,) but for them, he would have *fallen a victim* to the malice of his foes *before he did*."—p. 190.

Thus, we learn, that had it not been for the mere circumstance of Christ making use of mysterious language, and of the common people being present on one occasion, the priests and Pharisees would have killed Christ long before his time, and thus have broken "the unalterable decree of Jehovah!" These circumstances were possible, hence it was possible to break that *unalterable decree;* and if one of God's unalterable decrees could have been broken, may it not be possible for another to give way? And where then is the absolute certainty of universal salvation, even admitting that God had decreed it?

"It is somewhat singular, nay, it is very remarkable, that while all other nations had their respective hells, the Jews, who were especially instructed in religion by Jehovah for the space of 2000 years, ☞*were without any ideas on that subject*."—p. 278.

Yes, these Jews had no idea of hell punishment, yet he tells us, that in the days of the Saviour ☞"*these classes themselves believed in endless misery.*" (p. 190.) Yet they "*were without any ideas on the subject!*"

"To me this seems the most probable construction of the text; for *gehenna* was associated in the minds of the Jews, *with everything horrid, loathsome,* and *abominable*."—p. 277.

Well, as the Jews had an idea of "*endless misery,*" they must have understood *gehenna* to signify that: for, mark the fact, it "was associated in the minds of Jews, with every thing ☞HORRID, *loathsome* and *abominable!*" Now let us see, if the Pro and Con will not contradict all this, and tell us that *gehenna,* (the word translated hell,) was not understood to signify any such thing!

"Others again think that Jehovah is alluded to, as the object to be feared, not on the ground of his ability to destroy in a hell beyond the

'e, for *gehenna*, in that day ☞ *was not received in any such sense.*" 277.

Then it was not understood as signifying every thing *rrid*," for the Pro and Con tells us that the Jews at t time held the "*horrid*" dogma of an endless hell, so t there is a contradiction out some place! But again:

But my opponent represents it [Universalism] as holding out engagement to sin, by telling men, that the shorter they render their on earth by their crimes, the sooner they will get to heaven. Now objection to Universalism rests upon the false assumption that men according to this theory, immediately from earth to *heaven*. This *nistake!*"—p. 149.

Now you will observe, that men do not go to heaven en they die, but to an intermediate state, where they ain until the resurrection, when they are admitted heaven; and this is the only reason he can assign r men should not commit suicide, if Universalism be ! As this is the only objection to suicide, we will his author clear it up in his "Memoranda."

During the day the preaching was done in the woods, and at night e Union meeting-house. The assemblage present was large, pernumbering two thousand persons. Many were present from dis- s of fifty or sixty miles, and many also who were zealous and g men in our Israel. There were Jacob Felter, ☞ *now in* HEAV- '—p. 183.

Thus Jacob Felter went to *heaven* when he died, withwaiting for the resurrection, and as Universalism hes that sin cannot extend beyond this life, and contently that all are equally safe after death, it follows other folks can go to heaven at death, as well as b Felter, it matters not what death they die, only if die by suicide they will get there the sooner, which es it preferable to any other! But he admits that l expressed great anxiety with regard to the ultimate ation of the Jews. Notice his language.

Now for the Jews. Was Paul a believer in their *ultimate salva-* *What*, then, means the *anxiety* expressed in the following lan- s? 'Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, they might be *saved;*' (Rom. 10. 1,) and the following is even more essive of anxiety, [i. e. *anxiety* of course for their *ultimate salva-*] 'I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing

me witness in the Holy Ghost, that *I have great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart*, for I could wish that myself were *accursed* from Christ, for my *brethren*, my kinsmen according to the flesh.' (Rom. 9. 1-3)" p. 115.

The reader will bear in mind that all this *anxiety, sorrow*, and *heaviness of heart* which the apostle experienced, was with regard to the Jews, "ultimate salvation," which is a palpable acknowledgment that their ultimate salvation was exceedingly *doubtful*. But the Pro and Con, as usual, turns round, and contradicts himself; or rather, he contradicts himself before he has time to turn round.

"This language, dear reader, is easily accounted for, without resolving it into the *fears he entertained for their fate beyond the grave;* for on that head, as shall be shown, he had no fears whatever."—ibid.

He admits that Cornelius would not have been saved in the future life had he not have feared God and worked righteousness, and had he died without knowing Christ.

"That Cornelius would have been saved in the *future life*, even though he had not known Christ in this, *is evident from Peter's own words on the occasion:* 'Of a truth,' said he, 'I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him.' "—MEMORANDA, p. 135.

Thus, the only reason why Cornelius would have been saved in the future life, had he not known Christ in this, is, that he *feared God and worked righteousness!* Had he not have feared God and worked righteousness, and had he died before he came to know Christ, he would, according to a fair construction of this author's language, have failed of the ultimate salvation!

After quoting the text which speaks of the destruction of both soul and body in hell, he gives two reasons why it cannot refer to punishment beyond the grave, the latter of which we quote.

"The second fact is, that the *body*, which those whom they were told not to fear had the power to kill, is not *liable to destruction in a hell beyond the grave*, but *returns to the dust of the earth from whence it originated. How, then*, can gehenna, in this instance, imply a place of torment in a future state? It cannot!"—p. 116.

In this, as the most superficial reader can discover, he denies the resurrection of the body. It cannot, he tells us, be punished beyond the grave, from the fact that it *returns to the dust of the earth*, from whence it originated. See, now, if he does not get "*sick*" of this likewise!

"Paul assuredly speaks of a rising again of the *same body which is laid in the grave*. So also is the resurrection of the dead: *it* is sown in *corruption*, *it* is raised in *incorruption*."—p. 343.

This, mark it, is the same page where he got "*sick* of that *hypercritical scepticism*, which is ever directing its vulture glance to the spying out of *difficulties* in every thing proposed to its faith," just as he had done in more than fifty instances before, one of which is quoted above. It was "proposed to his faith" by the Lord himself, that we should not fear man who only had power to kill the body, but that we should fear God, who was able to destroy *both soul and body in hell:* but this "hypercritical sceptic" commenced immediately to the "spying out of difficulties." This is one way he has of disposing of a text which contradicts his theory; and another is, by making it part literal and part figurative, or by making it all figurative, whichever suits his purpose best. This I will show to be no misrepresentation. Look at his exposition of the rich man and Lazarus.

"By the 'rich man' is meant the Jewish nation, which for centuries had abounded in all spiritual privileges, *in this sense* 'they fared sumptuously every day,' and in the persons of their priesthood were *literally clad* '*in purple and fine linen*.' Christ represents Abraham as saying in regard to them, 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one *rose from the dead*,' which was *literally true*, for Christ had *actually raised one Lazarus to life*, and they yet remained as unbelieving as before."—p. 168.

Thus the "*rich man*" was a figure, but his "*purple and fine linen*" was *literal*:—Lazarus was *literal*, and Christ *literally* raised him from the dead; but the gulf was a figure, and signified moral *blindness!* This is certainly an accommodating parable. But there is a serious difficulty here in the way, according to the above exposition. The rich man, who had died and gone to

hell, signifies the whole Jewish nation. But he had five brethren, who were they? O, they were the Jewish nation too, according to the Pro and Con, for he takes the language of Abraham concerning them, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets," &c., and applies it to the Jewish nation, as you will see by the above quotation.

I shall now notice his evasion of the text in Peter, relative to the "new heavens and the new earth," as a specimen of Universalism upon all puzzling points. By a little attention to this example, the reader will be enabled to foil this system in its most successful attempts at evasion.

"Now that the 13th verse figuratively represents the gospel state, no attentive student of the bible will question. 'Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.' [2 Peter 2. 13.] With this compare the following in Isaiah: 'For behold I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy; and the voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying; There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall build houses and inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them,' &c. [Is. 65. 17-20.] This cannot belong to eternity, for it is presumed that people will not there *build houses*, nor *plant vineyards*, nor die even in their *hundredth year*."—p. 206.

You will discover, reader, that in order to carry his point, the Pro and Con first assumes that the text in Peter is figurative;—then quotes the text in Isaiah to prove it; but in order that this text prove his point, he assumes that *building houses, planting vineyards*, &c., are to be understood *literally*, and this being so, it follows that the *new heavens* and *new earth* are *figurative!* But I wonder if the Pro and Con thinks us all a set of dupes, and that we will sit dormant, and let him *assume* the eyes out of our heads? Not exactly. We have as good a right (yes, far better) to assume that the new heavens and *new earth* (the only very important matter in the

prediction) are *literal*, and that the inferior and minor points, such as *building houses* and *planting vineyards* are to be understood as a figurative representation of that "*moral advancement*," which the Pro and Con has taught us will be "*progressive*" in the eternal world! This is a principle, I venture the assertion, that Universalists never thought of. They consider themselves a superior class of beings,—a highly favored and privileged people, and that the orthodox are compelled to bow with all reverential submission to all their whims and assumptions! But it is hoped that the above will learn them a lesson worth two of that! Reader, when a Universalist attempts to offset your arguments by quoting and applying scripture as above, give him this principle, and the ship BALLOU will just then run foul of a breaker! But the Pro and Con must necessarily contradict himself upon this point, as it would be a departure from a general principle should he not! He argues, as above quoted, that the new heavens and new earth meant the gospel dispensation, and that they were created, of course, when the church of Christ commenced.

"Thanks be to God! I lie under no such obligation! The light of his word shines sufficiently bright on the pathway of my inquiries on these subjects to satisfy my understanding and my hopes. It informs me that 'in the *beginning* God *created* the *heavens* and the *earth*,' but no mention is made of his having created a hell. So also at the *conclusion* it speaks of 'a *new heaven* and a *new earth*,' but nothing whatever of a new hell."—p. 280.

Thus he admits that the "*new heavens and new earth*" are put in contrast with the "*heavens and earth*" which *God created* "in the beginning," which were *literal* of course; and hence the "new heavens and new earth" must also be *literal*, as the apostles could not be guilty of such nonsense, as contrasting the commencement of a dispensation with the creation of the literal heavens and earth! But the first heaven and earth was created "in the beginning," that is, the beginning of time, and the Pro and Con puts the new heavens and new earth "at the *conclusion*" which places them still in the future,

as time has not yet certainly come to a "*conclusion*."—Again: After telling us that the text in Isaiah, relative to the new heavens and new earth, could not refer to the future state, but signified the Christian dispensation, he adds:

"John, in Revelations, describes the *same state of things*.—'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away *all tears from their eyes;* and there shall be *no more death*, neither *sorrow*, nor *crying*, neither shall there be *any more pain; for the former things are passed away*.'"—p. 206.

The reader will bear in mind that this all is *figurative*, according to the Pro and Con, belonging to *this world*, and does not refer to the future state! *No more death—no more tears—no more sorrow*, "*for the former things are passed away*,"—all this is *figurative* and belongs to this life! But let us read again.

"Undoubtedly the several passages in this book [Revelations] which speak of these events, are to be understood as implying, that under the benign government of Messiah *all evils*, both physical and moral, shall come to an ULTIMATE END; *no more tears—no more night*—NO MORE DEATH—*no more sin—no more sickness, nor* SORROW, 'FOR THE FORMER THINGS SHALL BE DONE AWAY'—no farther need of *sun*, nor *moon*, for the *quenchless*, and unsettling glory of Jehovah, shall be the *future light of all intelligences forever!*"—p. 217.

Ten pages back, it all belonged to this present time, and did not refer to the future state at all; but now he gets "sick of this view, and comes to the conclusion that it refers to that period when "*all evils, both physical and moral, shall come to an ULTIMATE END*," and that it refers to that state of existence where "Jehovah shall be the future light of *all intelligences* forever," which most flatly contradicts his former position, that it belongs to *this life;* for the Pro and Con will not contend that "*all intelligences*" enjoy that light in this world!

"We see not, as sees the all-seeing God: he saw Montezuma, for example, suffering under the cruelties of Cortez: perhaps also he had

oft seen others suffering under the cruelties of Montezuma, and in that case the sufferings of the latter were but a *just measure of retribution.*" —p. 201.

But suppose Montezuma had escaped these cruelties, he would consequently have gone into eternity without "*a just measure of retribution,*" and as certain as God is *just*, he would have received it in the eternal world! —Look at that sailor—that pirate, who has *tortured* and *butchered* his hundreds of innocent men, women, and children, and finally he drops into eternity with less sufferings than men in general experience:—where does he get his "*just measure of retribution?*" Not in this life certainly, and hence he must get it in eternity! But the Pro and Con will say, as he frequently does, that his "just measure of retribution" was the *compunctions* of conscience which he experienced, as he committed the crimes. But how did it happen that Montezuma did not get his "just measure of retribution" from the *compunctions* of conscience, without having to suffer under the cruelties of Cortez? Conscience, it appears in that case, could not meet the demands of justice! But we will now let the Pro and Con decide how conscience operates upon that sailor.

"The cheek of the mariner is blanched with dismay, and the prayer of agony quavers on his lips, when his storm-tossed vessel seems on the point of being engulphed in the troubled element beneath him; but the danger passed, he laughs at his fears and *blasphemes* the name of God ☞ *without* COMPUNCTION!"—p. 199.

This is admitting that the conscience of a wicked man will not *goad* him, only when he is about to be launched into the realities of a dreadful eternity. Had that *mariner* been a regular Universalist, his conscience would have felt no remorse, and his soul would not have been thus overwhelmed with alarm, when he came to stand upon the precincts of eternity. It was the fear of a judgment after death which so harrowed up his guilty soul, as the Pro and Con admits, in the sentence just preceding this quotation! Now, as he confesses that those wicked mariners will "*blaspheme* the name of God *without compunction,*" how will they ever get "a just

measure of retribution," if they continue thus to blaspheme the name of God for years, as hundreds of them do, and finally go into eternity in an instant, without even time to feel remorse? If Montezuma got "*a just measure of retribution*," and no more than justice, then these blaspheming mariners must suffer for their sins in the future life. But how much punishment must they endure? Read the following.

"The law of God, speaking of it not in a particular, but in a general sense, is a copy of his eternal perfections—is a necessary emanation from his pure and holy nature. On his law, therefore, the divine being has stamped the impress of himself. No thinking man will hesitate a moment to admit this fact."—p. 70.

Thus he admits that the "*law of God*" is *infinite*, as it is "*a copy of his eternal perfections*"—"a necessary *emanation from his pure and holy nature*," on which he "has stamped the *impress* of himself!" As the law of God is thus declared to be *infinite*, its penalties must, like itself, be also *infinite*, as penalties, in one sense, is a component part of the law; and thus we have *infinite punishment* as a necessary and logical conclusion. But he makes out that the Almighty himself will not endure in the future state.

"My opponent's supposition, then, you perceive, that the everlasting *kingdom of Christ* is in eternity, is quite wide of the fact."—p. 140.

Thus he makes out that the *kingdom of Christ* will not extend into eternity, but will *end with time*.

"The rising from them a line of prophets reaching down in unbroken succession to the rise of the prophet of prophets, Christ Messiah, through whom a more *glorious kingdom* should be established as wide in its sway as the extension of being, and *as lasting as the age of the Most High*."—p. 287.

Then, of course, if the kingdom of Christ is "*as lasting as the age of the Most High*," and still, will not extend into eternity, follows it not, then, that the age of the Most High will cease with the duration of time? But this is not the worst of it, for the very logic of the Pro and Con makes out that there is no God, never was, nor never will be!

"It is known to every attentive biblical student, that in figurative language a person was said to be the child of any *circumstances*, or *abstract quality* by which he was distinguished; hence we read of children of *light*—of the *day*—of *darkness*—of *Belial*—of *God*. If we are to understand any of these expressions in a *strict sense*, why not *all*? Is it not obvious that *neither of these* were designed for a *literal interpretation!*"—p. 83.

Hence we are driven into the conclusion that *God* is no more than an "*abstract quality*,"—no more of a real being than "Belial," which the Pro and Con asserts to be nothing more than a mere *principle of evil!* I have always thought that Universalists could philosophize the Almighty out of existence, upon the same principle they do the devil; but I never knew before that any of them had tried the experiment! When I charge the Pro and Con with *absurdity*, the reader must discover that I have ground for the charge. See another example:

"Universalists maintain that God's love is *as strong* beyond, as on this side of the grave; and that what it *fails* of accomplishing here, it will *infallibly* accomplish hereafter."—p. 57.

Yes! because "God's love is *as strong*," and no stronger beyond the grave than it is this side, therefore it will certainly do in eternity *what it cannot do in time!* Of all men to draw conclusions, that Pro and Con takes the lead!

"For we think (as my opponent has said) that a *doctrine must be false*, which can fairly be *reduced to an absurdity*."—p. 148.

Then the Pro and Con "must be false," for a greater bundle of absurdities and contradictions was never wrapped up in the same amount of paper!

"It is admitted that if a doctrine be of *bad practical tendency*, however *plausible* in itself, *the divine sanction must not be claimed for it*."—p. 44.

We shall now close these strictures, by taking up the Pro and Con at his own offer and upon his own *admission*. We have already proved Universalism to be of "bad practical tendency," as it holds out *infinite motives* to encourage the practice of wickedness! But I will now prove the doctrine "of bad practical tendency" from another source—from facts—*stubborn* facts, which the

Pro and Con, (with all the fraternity of Universalists,) cannot—and *dare not* controvert. These *facts* will be adduced from one of their own party—a strong defender of their faith, and one in high standing with them as an editor, and the author of a book which is lately from the press, and now being actively circulated by the denomination. The individual to whom I refer is known by the name of Lewis C. Todd, who once renounced Universalism, after preaching the doctrine twelve years, but has now gone back, and is acknowledged by the party, as above stated, to be an *honest* man, and an able advocate of the doctrine. If L. C. Todd was now opposed to Universalism, I should deem it puerile, in the extreme, to quote from him; for let his testimony be ever so true, it would still have no weight with Universalists; but as it is, they are bound to receive his testimony, so far as he states *facts* to which he was an eye and ear witness! Upon such matters he could not have been mistaken, as his acquaintance, with the character of Universalists generally, was so extensive; and hence those facts which he states to have seen and heard, *are true*, or else L. C. Todd was a *dishonest* man—a black-hearted hypocrite: and if he was dishonest then, he is dishonest yet; but as all Universalists admit him to be an honest man *now*, they are compelled to admit that he was an honest man *then*, and ergo, the facts he states are *prima facie* evidence in this case. No man can disprove them but the author, and there is no way he can do it, but by proving himself one of the most base and malicious falsifiers that ever lived! This, I presume, he will not undertake, and it is just as presumable that none of his brethren will undertake it for him! Hence his testimony, relative to the practical tendency of Universalism, and the character of its professors, ☞ *must be received!* I quote from his "*defence.*"

"I had seen the blessed influence of the doctrine spread out often on paper, but I could not see them any where else! No—God knows I am *honest* in this assertion. I do not feel to abuse the denomination, but it is

true that I could not for my life see any good resulting to society from the sentiment.——How it may be in New England I do not know; but *this I know* that it is not a misrepresentation of their religious condition so far as I know anything about them. I would not speak harshly of them. My affections have clung to them with almost the grasp of desperation. Certainly as a people they deserve no evil at my hands. I only wish to speak of the general effects of the doctrine. I know individuals among them, of the most amiable dispositions and characters, that would honor any profession. But I do not think their doctrine ever made them so. I candidly aver, in the fear of God, that I do not believe the doctrine ever made a single soul any better than he otherwise would have been, while it has been the means of removing necessary restraints, and giving latitude to thousands, whose propensities and passions needed restraint, whereby they have indulged in criminal pursuits and gone to perdition. *I only judge from what I know—from what I have seen*, in reference to the general effects of the doctrine. 'The tree must be known by its fruits.'—And after taking the *fruits* of the tree of Universalism, into long, deliberate, and prayerful consideration, so far as I have ever *seen them*, I am compelled to conclude the tree is radically defective. When I learn of a *single drunkard*, or *swearer*, or *gambler*, or *debauchee*, or *knave*, being *reformed* in consequence of the Universalist doctrine, I shall think better of its influence than I do now, for it is my solemn opinion that such an instance never occurred.———

"All that, and much more, I told him, [Mr. Stacy,] expressing in the most pointed terms that I was dissatisfied and disappointed with the denomination, on account of their *indifference to piety*, the *profanity*, *gambling*, and other *bad habits so common among them*.—Making a few exceptions, I still say, that *I have all the evidence that such a case admits of*, that a majority of the called Universalists, are so unfriendly to religion, that they would do *ten times more to destroy all religion* than to

support any. They will support *Universalism*, but not as *religion*, nor for *religion*, but for the purpose of *destroying religion*, as it actually does to a great extent where it prevails. ☞ *Many of them have told me so!* —There are some, very few, real Universalists, who will pay from principle—there are, besides, *Atheists*, *Deists*, *gamblers*, *drunkards*, and most all the *opposers of religion*, who are pleased with Universalism, and *take that name*. All these will pay for it, as the *surest* way to *do away religion!* Had I been a *sceptic* and *hypocrite*, I might now have been a professor of Universalism in the "full tide of successful experiment."——I have had a great opportunity to know the character, views, and feelings of professed Universalists,—full as good an opportunity as Mr. Skinner. There are some, but not many Universalist preachers in the United States, that have had a more extensive opportunity to judge of the practical effects of the doctrine, from the conduct of its professors, than myself. I have found worthy and amiable persons attached to the doctrine—this is true—but such ones would freely acknowledge that the number of such was *very small* "around there." They generally thought its friends away off somewhere else were better; but I am satisfied that their leading characteristics, in any place or village, are the same in all, or nearly all places where they are to be found. As a general remark, wherever I went to promulgate the doctrine, many who stood forth as its friends were of the *lower part* of society. *Sabbath-breakers*, *scoffers*, *tiplers*, *swearers*, and *gamblers* would gather around me with a warmth bordering on devotion. They found little to please them, however, in my preaching, *except the doctrine;* and often when I pointed out these vices in all their blackness to them, they would be offended; say I was bad as the orthodox; and *swear they wanted Universalism*, and not any of such "*reformation stuff*," and the like. Often have I been accosted in company, by men, reeling under their load of strong drink, who have held me by the hand, to hear their assurances of ap-

plause, affection, and good will; and to hear them descant upon the "glorious plan of universal salvation," the "boundless extent of divine love," and to adduce their reasons, "strong as holy writ," to prove the truth of that sentiment, and the folly of everything else, till pale with disgust, or suffused with shame, or half suffocated with their breath, I have forced myself away.——So there is a kind of religious quackery in the land, which affects great sympathy for the occasional evils connected with the doctrine of future retribution, but has no sympathy for the sufferings resulting from the vices which that doctrine would suppress—has no tender heart to "*wither*" over the *dissipation*, the *licentiousness*, the *crimes*, the *murders*, the *blasted hopes of parents*, the sighs of *heart-broken* wives and husbands, the *anguish* and *misery* of children beggared and orphaned in the *appalling career of vice*, the *agony*, and *tears*, and *shame* which mark the *footsteps of sin* which every where increase and spread with the *increase* and *spread* of *Universalism* and *infidelity*. I say *Universalism* and *infidelity*, because one is the general *precursor* of the other.

"Let these men boast of their charity; I know the doctrine they profess requires the exercise of charity—so does christianity in all its forms. But I have read TEN PERIODICAL UNIVERSALIST PAPERS for two years, and the SARCASM and MALIGNITY running through these papers against everything but their own interests, had a powerful tendency in opening my eyes, and convincing me that there was LITTLE OR NO RELIGION AMONG THEM.—In the winter before the renunciation, L. Davis, Esq., of Carroll, returned from Cincinnati, authorized to engage me to go there. He held out the most encouraging prospects in a pecuniary point of view, and urged me to go. And I will here remark that he is well known as a Universalist of the conscientious kind. And HE ADMITTED TO ME THAT UNIVERSALISTS GENERALLY WERE NOT PIOUS, and that he had, for years, MOURNED OVER THE COURSE THEY PURSUED IN RELA-

TION TO RELIGION.——Mr. Stacy cannot deny that ever since he has been in the western country, for some two or three years, whenever I have had an opportunity, I have been complaining of the *swearing*, *drinking*, *gambling*, and other *vicious habits among Universalists*, and the *entire want* of anything like a *religious course* among them. Mr. Stacy too, always used to *admit that things were so;* and often expressed regret that it was so, but hoped that Universalists would some day take a different course. Almost a year before the renunciation I was at Warren, (Pa.,) preached in the morning and evening, and Mr. Sweet in the afternoon. Mr. Sweet was a Universalist preacher from Ohio, who had come there that day with Mr. Stacy.—We there, in company with others, were talking, that day, on the character and religious course of Universalists generally. Mr. Sweet said he was generally and extensively acquainted with Universalists in Ohio,—that there was VERY LITTLE THE APPEARANCE OF RELIGION OR PIETY AMONG THEM,—that societies almost without number had been formed, but the members seemed to take no interest in the cause, and generally, within two or three years after their formation, some would join the orthodox, but most would avow Deism, and they would cease to be, as societies. He represented them to be in a very dead, low, and miserable condition, as it respects religion; and he considered this to be the general condition of Universalists. Mr. Stacy was by, and did not deny that it was so, but said that we must try to bring about a better state of things. Others were present to hear some of the conversation. A person present at that time asked me why it was so, that Universalists would take such a course as they did; and I answered, 'The reason is, that the principal part of *Universalists* are *Deists* in reality;' the person replied: 'I believe in my soul they are.' This was in the presence of Mr. Stacy, and he *smiled*, which I considered his *assent* that it was *true*. I told Mr. Sweet that his description of Universalists would apply generally to them wherever I had been ac-

quainted with them; and he told me he did not care about going among them if that were the case.—And the 'unobtrusive practical virtue of Universalists' is, generally, *Sabbath-breaking*, *profanity*, *intemperance*, contempt of all the appearances and means of *piety*, horrid fears of priestcraft, but no fears about any other craft; GAMBLING, LAUGHING, SCOFFING and SWEARING ABOUT PRAYING, PREACHING, RELIGIOUS MEETINGS, and RELIGIOUS PEOPLE, finding contradictions in the bible, and other great difficulties, etc., etc., etc.——The author *saw these things* till his heart sickened. He was reading many Universalist periodicals, and became fully satisfied from the drift and general course of them, that their secret object appeared to be, and their actual effect was, to RAISE DOUBTS in the minds of their readers, on one religious subject after another, TILL THEY SHOULD BELIEVE IN NONE; and by inuendoes, and sarcastic reflections upon the errors of christians, to spread abroad a deep and universal prejudice against a GOSPEL MINISTRY, the BIBLE, and ALL RELIGION. He became satisfied beyond a SINGLE DOUBT that all this was TRUE. He conversed also with many professors of Universalism at different times, and found *most all of them* to view the subject in the *same light*. Most all of them to be *enemies to christianity*, and consider the whole engine of Universalism now in the United States, to be a shrewd and well concerted scheme to bring together the elements and efforts of unbelief, to overthrow in the end, the christian religion. His candid opinion is, *and has long been*, that *ninety-nine* out of *a hundred* who profess publicly to be Universalists, *are unbelievers in divine revelation*. I say this in the fear of God, as the result of *all I know of them*. That the nature of their doctrine is such that most of them [the preachers] as well as their hearers, become so much tinctured with *scepticism*, that their teachings lead to the same end that *open infidelity* would. That there are some honest and sincere both among teachers and people, I have no doubt. There are a few learned, gifted, and talented men among

the preachers, who would be useful in a good cause; but many of them are illiterate, and only qualified for levity, scurrility, and miserable satire. Winchester and Murray, I think, were pious, but their system was no sooner abroad than *infidels*, who had been foiled in their recent open attacks on religion, discovered in Universalism a disguise for their doctrines, and spread it forth with zeal, fully satisfied that it would answer their purpose just as well. Hence the numerous conversions of *infidels* to *Universalism*, which signifies nothing more than the shifting of an unpopular name for one more plausible. *Infidels* and *loose wicked men* have *cherished* the doctrine enough to make it suspicious, and offensive to the christian, were there no other objection to it.——The author of this work once preached Universalism in Ripley, Chautauque co., (N. Y.,) where he found among his hearers a *Universalist drunkard*—he had been a *preacher!* But he was a constant attendant on the preaching. He extolled it—he praised the glorious sentiment, till we preached directly against drunkenness, and then he fled—we have never seen him since. His name was Winslow. He liked the doctrine; but to hear a Universalist preacher condemn drunkenness so pointedly, was more than he could bear. So it is with the *wicked generally;* they love the doctrine, and love their sins both at once. How often do we hear men and boys talking of the 'unbounded love of God,' with a *profane oath* in almost every sentence! The most *abandoned swearers*, and most *abominable characters* through the States, are frequently found advocating, amidst *shocking oaths* and *drunken revelry*, the 'liberal sentiment!' We should be sorry to state such things if we thought it POSSIBLE TO BE MISTAKEN. BUT WE CANNOT BE, ☞ UNLESS OUR VERY SENSES HAVE DECEIVED US." ☜ [Pages 14, 16, 17, 34, 38, 40, 44, 45, 51, 55, 63, 64, 80, 81, 84, 89, 97, 98, 123, 124.]

So much, reader, for the "practical tendency" of Universalism, and the influence it has upon the characters of "NINETY-NINE OUT OF A HUNDRED" of its professors!

It is true the author of this testimony, since going back to the Universalists, has published to the world that he was affected with a mental derangement when he published his book! But how does he know but that he is deranged NOW? for if his SENSES DECEIVED HIM THEN, he is no better off now, and has no stronger evidence to prove that he is now in his right mind! It is my solemn opinion, that if ever the man was crazy, it was at the time ("after being clean escaped from them that live in error") when he went back and had his name enrolled among a brotherhood of "Infidels," "Atheists," "gamblers," "drunkards," "scoffers at religion," "profane swearers," "sabbath breakers," "debauchees," which he knew to be such from his own "SENSES," the best evidence in the world, and the only testimony by which he now knows he has an existence! The reader can judge for himself, from the foregoing extracts, whether he writes as if under the influence of insanity.

Now friend George, I bid you farewell;—I believe you to be an honest man, but wofully deceived; and hence I impute your contradictions, and incoherent suicidal speculation, not to any lack on your part, either morally or intellectually, but to the sheer deficiency, and the radical rottenness of the system you were endeavoring to defend! I have no feelings towards you but those of kindness and friendship, and should I ever see your face, you will, I trust, find me what I here profess to be, your friend and well wisher. May we all desire, and seek after the truth, that it may make us FREE INDEED!

CONCLUSION.

A WORD TO UNIVERSALIST PREACHERS.

Gentlemen: Permit me, in the plenitude of your charity, to address you one word, in the conclusion of this work, relative to the subject therein discussed, and the position which *you* occupy to the public, as preachers of universal salvation. If you have read the foregoing pages, as you doubtless have, and are still inclined to believe in Universalism, you nevertheless, I think, will not hesitate to admit that it is not altogether and absolutely certain that all will be saved, and that something at least, can be presented against your doctrine, and in favor of the opposite theory. I do not look for this acknowledgement to be made to me; but to your own consciences you are compelled, methinks, to make this admission. Having read the ten preceding chapters, can you, in the presence of an all-seeing God, lay your hand upon your heart, and say that Universalism is not at least *doubtful*, and that there is not at least a probability (weighing all the evidence in the case) that a part of mankind will be eternally lost? If you do admit the bible to be in reality a revelation from God, and to be an umpire in this question, permit me to ask again: Would you be willing, at this time, to risk your *life*, or even your *earthly fortune*, upon the certainty of Universalism being true, and let omniscience decide the question *tomorrow?* What say you? I make this solemn appeal to your *honesty*, and you will undoubtedly, if that be one of your attributes, answer this question in the negative. Well then, if Universalism be not so absolutely *certain*, that you would be willing to risk your *present life* upon its verity, how then, in the name of reason and consistency, dare you venture upon it your eternal *all*, which bears no more comparison with the former, than the smallest conceivable *speck*, to all the mighty orbs throughout the boundless empire of Jehovah?

Suppose we grant you, for the sake of argument, that

Universalism is calculated to give more *present* enjoyment than the opposite faith; still consistency and propriety most emphatically forbid your preaching the doctrine for any earthly consideration whatever, unless you have testimony most *positive* and *unequivocal* in favor of universal salvation. In order that your testimony *be positive*, it must be such as excludes all possibility of doubt, and such as precludes all necessity for *inference*, or if you must infer, let it be the only *possible inference* that can be drawn! With this definition of *positive* testimony, which I think you will not hesitate in admitting, you must see that you have nothing you can claim as *positive* testimony, in favor of your doctrine.—Take, for example, 1 Tim. 2. 4, "God will have all men to be saved." This, as you will admit, is as near positive testimony as anything you have in the bible. But so far from its being *positive*, it is no testimony at all, as you will see by referring back to the article upon that text, Chap. 1, page 116. Your argument, in this case, is based upon no less than *four inferences*. 1. You *infer* that this language has reference to *eternity* and not to *time*. 2. That God's "will" is always and in every case accomplished. 3. That "*saved*" here signifies deliverance from sin; and 4. That "*all men*" here embraces the entire posterity of Adam! This is but a fair sample of your inferences upon every proof-text in the bible—whilst a majority of all those inferences can be refuted by positive testimony to the contrary, and the remainder can be nullified and set aside by just as plausible inferences in opposition to yours. Where, then, permit me to ask, is your *positive testimony*?

In order farther, that your testimony from the bible be *positive*, it must agree with the following sources of evidence. 1. It must be that construction which makes best sense of the text itself. 2. That construction must agree with the context, and with the circumstances of the case. 3. It must agree with all parallel passages; and 4. It must harmonize with the general tenor and scope of the bible upon that subject! If your doctrine

should fail in either of these particulars, it most inevitably fails of positive testimony. From this argument also, you must discover, methinks, that your doctrine, when weighed in the scripture balance will be found wanting, as regards *positive* evidence! There may be a *possibility* of a doctrine being true, but all the possibilities in the world, in favor of a doctrine, would not amount to positive testimony. Again: there may be even a *probability* in favor of the truth of a doctrine, but this, likewise, falls immensely short of *positive* proof. Suppose we grant you, for the sake of coming at the point, that your doctrine has a *possibility*, or even a *probability* in its favor; still the fact of its not being *positive*, proves that there is at least a probability against it; and this, under a most solemn responsibility, forbids your preaching the doctrine; as a probability against it will weigh as much more than one in its favor, as the infinite concerns of eternity are superior to those of time. But suppose the two doctrines on an equal footing, as regards *probabilities* in favor of each, still, gentlemen, you would act far more wisely and consistently in running the risk of loosing the small pittance of present enjoyment, which your doctrine is calculated to yield over and above the other, (admitting such to be the fact,) which can be realized but a few years at most, rather than run the risk of losing the sublimated joys of an endless life—the imperishable and unsearchable riches of eternity! If there were but a single probability against your doctrine, whilst you had *ten thousand* in its favor, still this bears no comparison with the incomprehensible difference between this rivulet of time, and the shoreless ocean of eternity! Think, then, of the untold and numberless myriads of ages, of deathless felicity, which many, by the instrumentality of your doctrine, *may* lose, if there were but one probability in a *million* against it. This, of itself, is a sufficient reason why you should cease promulgating it; but how much greater are your obligations to renounce that unsafe and dangerous system, when, as your candor must compel you to admit, there

is not a single text in the bible in its support, whilst there are scores of passages which most pointedly teach the opposite doctrine! Will your consciences, then, permit you to continue propagating a theory which is calculated, as you admit, to better the condition of no man in the future world, when at the same time you hazard the loss of an eternity of bliss?

But matters stand vastly different with us. We are perfectly safe, yourselves being judges, as regards the future life, if we have but a single probability in favor of our theory, whilst there are five hundred against it; or even if the doctrine should prove utterly false. We can lose nothing, yourselves admit, by rejecting Universalism, except a paltry pittance of present enjoyment, which, if so, will be no less in the outcome; for if your doctrine prove true, we shall be the happier when we come to find out our mistake! Though in this world we sometimes "heave the pensive sigh," when looking over the wickedness of men, and thinking, as we suppose, of the awful destiny that awaits them, yet we shall be doubly paid for all such ignorant fears, in the event of universal salvation, for we shall all be happily disappointed, and the wonderful contrast between what we supposed, and what will really exist, will tend to augment our future and eternal bliss; and hence, we can lose nothing either in time or in eternity, in believing and preaching the falsehood of orthodoxy as long as we live, providing only, we should be disappointed in the end, and your doctrine should prove true!

Will you not, then, choose the safe side of this momentous question? If you were going to take a voyage across the ocean, would you embark in that large vessel which is both rotten and leaky, and will stand three chances out of four of going to the bottom before it reaches the opposite coast; or would you prefer a berth in that smaller one, which, although not so roomy and commodious in some respects, is nevertheless perfectly sound and safe, and will convey you most certainly to your point of destination? You would certainly, (if you

regard your own safety, rather than make the trip in that large ship UNIVERSALISM, and be furnished with the most extravagant accommodations,) prefer taking even a deck passage on that little *brig* ORTHODOXY, if you should thereby even be exposed to the piercing wind, and an occasional drenching from the surging billows! Why not, gentlemen, manifest the same amount of cautiousness and consistency with reference to the inconceivably more important concerns of eternity? Why not prefer a certainty to an uncertainty? If you have not positive testimony in favor of your system, which you must admit you have not;—why then preach the doctrine? What blind infatuation must influence that man who is willing to risk his immortal inheritance upon a game at *chance*, when the probabilities are decidedly against him—a chance, upon which he would not venture to hazard one hundred dollars!

Dear sirs, permit me to speak to you freely:—let not "the pride of life," I beseech you, or "the God of this world" blind your eyes to your highest—most exalted interests. Whoever would not be on the safe side of a doubtful question, especially one which involves as much as the one now under consideration, must be most self-willed and presumptuous, having shut his eyes to the light of self-interest, and closed his ears against the voice of reason!

Permit me, then, in the conclusion of this short, but friendly address, to remark, that as you admit us to be perfectly safe in our theory, as regards the future life; and if we do experience some trials and sorrows, as the result of our orthodox heresy in this world, still your doctrine informs us that this shall all be overruled for our good hereafter, and will work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory;—hence you have no motive which you can hold out, to induce us to leave orthodoxy and embrace Universalism, let it be ever so true, and therefore you need not make the attempt.

We would have you know that we are perfectly unconvertible to that system, which, if true, gives us to

understand that although we do not enjoy as much happiness without it here, yet we shall possess the more in the future world on that account, and that "thereby our happiness will be *enhanced for eternity*." Hence, we have no reason in the world for becoming converts to your doctrine, whilst on the contrary, from the *uncertainty* of your theory, and the *safety* of ours, you have every reason, both in this world and in that which is to come, for renouncing Universalism and becoming converts to the orthodox faith! I think, gentlemen, honestly and candidly, you had better give it up. You have had rather a hard tussel for it so far, and you have saved no one by your effort. Just, then, please be consistent for once, and throw away that thing of Universalism; for why waste paper and puff out your breath of life in defending a cause so perfectly barren and unfruitful, as is the one in which you are now engaged? I subscribe myself most truly and benevolently, your friend, A. H.

TO THE READER.

Reader: You are now through the book, and have doubtless detected many imperfections, both in style and language: but a few words of explanation will perhaps apologize for such, and all other defects which you may have discovered in the foregoing pages:

Six months only have elapsed since the author first commenced writing this work, during which time his attention has been engrossed by many cares and perplexities, which are not very great facilities in the prosecution of a work of this character. Being engaged in a partnership manufacturing establishment, the concerns of which must necessarily demand a share of his thoughts, and the additional concern of providing for the contingent necessities and accommodations of a large family of boarders, all served as impediments in the way of carrying out this work as perfectly as it would have been

done, perhaps, under more favorable circumstances.—The ministerial duties of the author, likewise, in attending to his appointments, sometimes at the distance of thirty or forty miles from home—during the same period receiving, and replying to, about *one hundred and fifty letters*—and the additional loss of two days in each week, in riding to St. Clairsville, (and back,) in order to "correct proof," have levied a heavy tax upon his time, leaving but little over three months for the writing of the whole work.

The book was commenced being printed when but a few pages of the manuscript were written, and frequently the author found himself under the necessity of writing the greater part of the night, in order to supply the printers with copy. We have had a pretty tight race for it, but fortunately I have come out a little ahead!

These facts are stated, courteous reader, not with the view of begging mercy at the hands of Universalist preachers and editors, as far, at least, as argument is concerned, for in such matters the author neither gives nor asks quarter:—but he supposes that these considerations, in connection with his own age and inexperience, (this being his *first book*,) will serve as an apology for all literary and scientific aberrations, from which he cannot possess the vanity to suppose his work entirely exempt.

The author does not design to leave the impression that he claims originality for *all* the arguments herein presented; yet he believes that the main body of the work is *new*, and has never before been presented to the public. This consideration has induced him to send it forth as bread cast upon the waters, hoping that it may prove instrumental, in the hands of an overruling providence, of turning many from the error of their ways; to which end, may God grant it abundant success.

THE AUTHOR.

St. Clairsville, June 15, 1846

A TABLE OF REFERENCES.

chap.	verse.	page.
Genesis.		
1	31	327
2	16,17	215
3	14	256
6	6,7	400
"	13	413
"	17	62
"	19,20	61
7	21	36
8	22	184
9	11	184,413
15	13–16	8
18	12	258
18	20	400
22	18	5,387
Exodus.		
7	1	253
12	25	9
17	9	356
23	14	400
	22	104
28	35	181
34	6,7	265
Leviticus.		
9	22,23	182
11	46	127
Numbers.		
14	28–35	10
23	10	234,314
27	16	36
Deuteronomy.		
5	1	83
8	5	361
18	64	51
20	20	111
21	18–21	319
28	——	189
30	19	356
32	19	44
Joshua.		
7	25	83
Judges.		
3	29	112,259
8	27	83
11	33	112

chap.	verse.	page.
1 Samuel.		
2	22	83
2	30	7
23	10–13	7
28	3	83
28	16	104
2 Samuel.		
18	17	83
24	12	356
1 Kings.		
3	28	83
8	36	109
8	62	84
14	13	84
2 Kings.		
27	18,20	27
1 Chronicles.		
11	4	84
15	28	84
28	9	33
2 Chronicles.		
13	15	84
Ezra.		
7	13	357
9	13	264
Esther.		
7	10	187
9	2	51
Job.		
1	——	254
2	——	254
11	7	317
20	12	226
22	5	377
Psalms.		
2	8	38
2	11	200
2	12	349
5	4	28,38
5	5	44
9	17	292,308
11	5	44
17	114	307
18	25	19,307
22	7	307
22	27	15

chap.	verse.	page.
25	10	19
32	10	19
34	19	296
37	37,38	308
50	23	127,308
53	5	44
55	23	287
62	4	296,419
73	3,5–9	296
78	38	262,267
78	41	318
86	9	15
103	8-12	267
103	13	20
103	17	109
116	15	308
136	——	19
145	9	17,347
147	11	35
148	7-13	128
150	6	128
Proverbs.		
1	24-28	20
1	29	356
2	14	296
10	24	21
11	21	264
11	31	22
14	32	307
17	15	365
20	4	43
21	10	366
26	7	205
29	1	308
Ecclesiastes.		
3	21	36
7	29	327
8	11	438
8	14	297
12	13-14	423
Isaiah.		
2	3	164
3	11	313

8 122,123

INDEX TO CHAPTERS.

☞All communications will be addressed to the author at Loydsville, Belmont Co., Ohio.

He is now editing and publishing a periodical in pamphlet form, devoted to the defense of Primitive Christianity, against the Sophistry and Deception of Universalism, Deism, and every other species of heresy and unbelief, as also to establish, and build up, vital and practical Christianity, in all the churches of the Saints. Its title is:—"The Gospel Proclamation;" containing 12 numbers to the volume, and 48 pages to the No., making a book at the close of the year, of about 580 duodecimo pages, for *one dollar only*, to be paid upon the reception of the first No.

Any person who will obtain three subscribers and forward on the amount of subscription, three dollars, he shall have the fourth copy gratis. Money sent at the publisher's risk.